

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 19, 1916.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

William F. Wolfe to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, December 19, 1916.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, our Heavenly Father, help us, we beseech Thee, to fulfill the longings, hopes, and aspirations of our hearts by resisting the allurements of sin and yielding to the demands of our better self, that we may satisfy our conscience, merit the full confidence of our fellow men, and enjoy the sweet and holy communion with Thee which is Life Eternal, the fruits of which are peace, joy, and righteousness in the Holy Ghost; and all praise be Thine, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CONDITIONS RELATING TO INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the House a very important matter, and being unable to assert that it is a privileged matter I ask unanimous consent for three minutes to make a statement about it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for three minutes to make a statement. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House will remember that last July Congress enacted a joint resolution raising a joint special committee to investigate conditions of transportation, expecting that that committee would work during the approaching recess of Congress; but the recess did not approach as early as we expected. The session was protracted into the fall, and the committee found themselves unable to accomplish much. They worked 14 days, I believe, before the meeting of the present session; but all the members of that committee from the two Houses are interested in legislation and are compelled to be present in their own committees and at the sessions of their respective Houses, and they have found it impossible to do justice to that investigation without neglecting their legislative duties. Therefore they have determined to ask the Congress, before proceeding any further, to extend the time in which that committee have to report, and they have instructed me to present to the House a resolution to that effect. In conformity with that instruction, I have introduced House joint resolution 323, extending the time from the second Monday in the approaching January until the succeeding year in which that committee may report. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of that joint resolution, discharging the committee to which it has been referred.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 323) to amend a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee," approved July 20, 1916.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ADAMSON. With pleasure.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does the gentleman really think that from the beginning this committee was necessary?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I assume that that question was concluded when Congress last summer determined to raise the committee for that investigation. I do not want to impeach the wisdom of the two Houses of Congress in ordering the investigation. We have done our best under that order to investigate. We have worked diligently, and we have not finished the work. If it was ever necessary, it is necessary yet.

Mr. RAYBURN. How long does the gentleman think it would take a committee of this character to investigate all the propositions contained in the Newlands resolution, with any degree of satisfaction, or to give any information which would be valuable to the country or to the House?

Mr. ADAMSON. We discussed that very question in the committee at the last meeting, and some of the members of

the committee thought 60 days, and I thought 30 days. I believe in 30 days of real work we can complete the hearings.

Mr. RAYBURN. The committee has been organized for six months.

Mr. ADAMSON. It was organized before Congress adjourned, but you know the members of that joint subcommittee are also active members of their respective committees and of the House, more or less, and that it is impossible for us to be in two places and to do two things at once. I myself have a sort of a one-track, narrow-gauge mind, and I can not do more than one important thing at a time. We found that during the session of Congress we could not do justice to the subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RAYBURN. I object.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FITZGERALD, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported a bill (H. R. 19178) to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 1232), which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves all points of order.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. About what, just for information?

Mr. ALLEN. On the instability of human institutions.

Mr. MANN. What is that?

Mr. ALLEN. In other words, on the attempt to abolish the Subtreasury at Cincinnati.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the conservation of our natural resources.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the conservation of our natural resources. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. McCracken, until January 12, on account of important business.

To Mr. CAREW, for the remainder of this week, on account of a death in his family.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. ANDERSON] be excused on account of sickness.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that his colleague [Mr. ANDERSON] be excused on account of sickness. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, with Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative bill, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 6. That to provide, during the fiscal year 1918, for increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate per annum less than \$1,200, and for increased compensation at the rate of 5 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate not more than \$1,800 per annum and not less than \$1,200 per annum, so much as may be necessary is appropriated: *Provided*, That this section shall only apply to the employees

of the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, and the executive and judicial establishments, who are appropriated for in this act specifically and under lump sums or whose employment is authorized herein: *Provided further*, That detailed reports shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next session showing the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided for herein.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the section.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether it is the desire of the committee to consider this section under the rule or as it stands in the bill. I should suppose they would want to consider it under the rule although they voted against the rule.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. We will consider it under the rule.

Mr. MANN. Not unless it goes out on a point of order. The rule authorizes an amendment to be offered and this is the original language. If the original language of the bill does not go out on a point of order the rule has no application whatever. I have reserved a point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We are not going to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order?

Mr. MANN. No, Mr. Chairman; I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will reserve a point of order for the time being.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no amendment. Section 6 was read and the gentleman from Wisconsin has reserved a point of order. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin make the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the original section in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman there is no original section in the bill.

Mr. MANN. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a new section:

Page 142, line 15, insert the following, a new section, as section 7: "That to provide, during the fiscal year 1918, for increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate per annum less than \$1,200, and for increased compensation at the rate of 5 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate not more than \$1,800 per annum and not less than \$1,200 per annum, so much as may be necessary is appropriated: *Provided*, That this section shall only apply to the employees of the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, and the executive and judicial establishments, who are appropriated for in this act specifically and under lump sums or whose employment is authorized herein: *Provided further*, That detailed reports shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next session showing the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided for herein."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Chair sustained the point of order. Under the ruling, has not section 6 gone out?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but this is offered as a new section—section 7.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will not that leave a hiatus?

The CHAIRMAN. That can be changed later on.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that while a member of the Committee on Appropriations has the prior right, the Chair did recognize the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] to offer an amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I am a member of the committee, and I offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I submit that when the gentleman from Colorado took the floor to offer an amendment there was no member of the committee asking for recognition by the Chair.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Nobody is entitled to offer an amendment at present. The gentleman from Tennessee has offered an amendment and is entitled to the floor under the five-minute rule. I suggest that we endeavor to make some arrangement for debate and have the proposed amendments submitted in

advance so that Members will know what we propose to discuss and what they will be called to vote upon. We can arrange the time and take the vote after the discussion is over.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state that he should have recognized the gentleman on the committee, but had already recognized the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING]. The gentleman from Tennessee has now offered an amendment and is entitled to the floor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I think that the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is a good one.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How much time is desired to discuss these questions?

Mr. CANNON. I would like a little time on an amendment I propose to offer to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MANN. I do not see how we can arrange time now.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If Members will indicate what their amendments are, we can arrange for it.

Mr. MANN. It is now 25 minutes past 11 o'clock, and we will probably not do any more than to finish this bill to-day. This is the last section of the bill. I do not think you can get much idea of how much time is necessary or desired until debate has run for a while.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Members would know what the different propositions are that they are called upon to vote on.

Mr. MANN. But there is no way of limiting the number of amendments.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We frequently do it by agreement.

Mr. STAFFORD. I suggest one hour on a side.

Mr. MANN. Oh, we can not get through this by half past 1 o'clock.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not suggesting any limit of time, but trying to find out how much time is wanted.

Mr. MANN. I think you had better run for a while.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We might ascertain how many amendments there are.

Mr. MANN. You can not, because some Member may offer an amendment later growing out of the situation. After the House has listened for a considerable length of time to this matter I think it will be disposed to close it up.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, when would it be in order to offer an amendment to the proposition submitted by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]?

The CHAIRMAN. As soon as the gentleman from Tennessee has yielded the floor on his amendment it will be in order to offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. We are operating under the five-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. We are.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is entitled to the floor, and then the Chair has promised to recognize the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is the gentleman from Tennessee to discuss his amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss this amendment at length now, and certainly not until after some of the amendments which certain Members have indicated they propose to offer have been presented. The committee felt, in view of the general sentiment which seems to exist, that some recognition ought to be taken of the fact that there is now and has been an unprecedented increase in the cost of living. The committee could not expect to bring in a proposition which would meet the views of every individual Member. There were various suggestions made in the committee, some involving a slightly greater increase, some involving a less increase. The matter was discussed and considered for several days in the committee, and after a very thorough discussion and consideration of all the questions arising, both as to the necessity for an increase and as to the condition of the Treasury, the committee finally agreed on the proposition reported in the bill, which has been re-presented as an amendment.

I submit to the gentlemen of the House that it is a fair and liberal increase under all of the circumstances and conditions. There is a sentiment existing in many portions of the country in favor of increases of the wages paid to employees, but I dare say there are few, if any, cases, certainly none which have been brought to my attention, where a greater increase has been allowed than 10 per cent, and the Department of Labor has reported that the usual rule in those cases where increases have been allowed is 10 per cent, among those factories and large

employers in the various textile mills in New England and other portions of the country, and I wish to call the attention of Members to the fact that in all those mills nearly all of the employees receive less than \$1,200 per annum. This committee has recommended that, in so far as the employees of the Government in this bill are concerned, there shall be an increase during the year 1918 of 10 per cent of the salary or wages paid to those employees who draw less than \$1,200 a year and 5 per cent to those who draw from \$1,200 to \$1,800 per year. Gentlemen must not forget the fact that when we undertake to establish a rule or precedent in this bill the same rule and precedent will be invoked when other appropriation bills come before the House. You must not forget the fact that this bill covers less than one-twentieth of the employees of the whole United States Government, and that in establishing this rule and precedent for less than one-twentieth of the employees of the Government you will later on be confronted with the question of whether or not you will be equally fair and equally liberal with the other nineteen-twentieths of the employees of the Government. I am speaking in round numbers and terms. It is impossible even with this amendment to determine accurately exactly what this amendment will mean in the way of an increase in the expenditures of the Government, due to the fact that many of the employees are employed under lump sums, and for an indefinite length of time; but as can best be determined the increase which would be brought about by the amendment proposed will mean from \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000 for the employees in this bill alone, and, as I have just suggested, the same rule will be invoked as to all of the other employees of the Government. So, you see that in establishing a rule of precedent here in this bill you may, if you adopt some of the propositions which will be presented later on in the day, and which I have heard privately discussed, establish a precedent that will increase the expenditures of the Government from fifty to one hundred millions of dollars, or even more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman whether or not the same reasons that impelled the raising of the wages of the clerks under \$1,200 by 10 per cent would not extend to the employees of the House and the Senate, who are compelled to live here in the District, and whether the committee recognized the fact that this bill carried appropriations for employees of the House and Senate, and whether the committee would not be willing to include the employees of the House and Senate in those entitled to the 10 per cent increase?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That was considered in the committee, but there is this distinction between the Capitol employees and the employees in the departments of the Government. This Congress will adjourn in March next. It is true the bill does not go into effect until July 1, 1918, but the next session of the House will not begin until next December. That session will probably be completed by June or July of the following year, or at the latest August. In other words, the employees of the Capitol are actually on duty about 12 out of the 24 months of the term, and therefore there is a distinction between the services performed by the Capitol employees and those who work in the departments from one year to another. As the gentleman knows, during the recesses of Congress the employees are given vacations, and probably half of them—I know in some particular cases that many—remain here while the other half go home or go about other business.

Mr. BORLAND. I think there is a large number of them who are unable to engage in any other business. Some of them are here, and those who go home are home only for a brief time, and possibly when they go home and come back it is in the end an expense instead of an advantage; so that it does seem to me that the same rule that would apply to clerks in the departments would apply to the employees of the Senate and House, and I desire to submit that proposition to the House.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will be able to discuss that when it is considered. I do not want to discuss this matter at length now, as I said, but I hope to be given the opportunity to say something else on the subject later on, after some of these amendments are offered. But I do want to repeat that the committee having this bill under consideration gave this matter the most serious and most deliberate consideration, and the committee was unanimously of the opinion that the increase proposed was most liberal, especially when

you take into consideration the fact, as the chairman of this committee stated yesterday, that we are facing a great deficit in the Treasury next year. The papers upon yesterday and today called the attention of Congress and the country to the fact that unless something is done, unless some measure is adopted which will increase the taxes and burdens of the people, it will become necessary to issue bonds next year.

Now, I have always been in favor of those who labor. I belong to that class myself, and I have never failed to cast my vote in favor of legislation looking to their welfare and to their interests; but, gentlemen, in passing upon this measure to-day we should think of the laboring man back home who will have to pay such increases as you place upon this bill and other appropriations. This money can not come out of the air; it does not grow upon trees; somebody has got to pay it; and those who will pay it are the laboring men back home and all over this country—the farmers and the business men. I think we should be fair to those who pay as well as to those who receive, and in our desire to serve the one we should not forget the other. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted without amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 142, line 16, after the word "provide," insert "during the remainder of the fiscal year 1917 and."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman from New York state his point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The pending amendment provides for increase of compensation during the fiscal year 1918, for which this bill makes appropriation. If it were proposed to increase the salary of some one place in the bill and an appropriation were carried to do so, it would not be seriously contended that a provision would be in order appropriating enough money to increase the compensation of that place during the remainder of the current fiscal year. The gentleman from Illinois will not make that contention. If that be true as to one it would be true as to two, and it would be true as to all positions in the bill. This bill makes appropriation for the executive, legislative, and judicial departments of the Government for the fiscal year ending 1918. The compensation for places during that year is provided, and this provision is not inconsistent with the purposes of the bill. It merely provides a scale of increase during the period for which the appropriations are made. The gentleman proposes to introduce a matter that is not germane, in that it would enact legislation proposing increases of compensation during the balance of the current fiscal year. I submit it is clearly subject to the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I think it is not subject to the point of order. I refer to Rule IX, paragraph 3, page 293, of the manual:

To appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government as herein provided, viz, for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses; for sundry civil expenses; for fortifications and coast defenses; for the District of Columbia; for pensions; and for all deficiencies—to the Committee on Appropriations.

So that the jurisdiction of that committee to report to the House for its consideration is covered by that rule without regard to which general appropriation bill the amendment might be offered.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In order to report a deficiency that is in order it must be authorized by law.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, the special rule authorizes the legislation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But it must be authorized by law. There is no authority for any increase of compensation for the balance of the current fiscal year.

Mr. CANNON. No authority. If the point of order was made upon this provision and sustained, that brings us to the consideration of this provision the same as if no point of order had been made.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is true; but the amendment must be germane to be in order.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely; and it is germane.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, the gentleman says, "Oh, no." I would be glad indeed if the gentleman would point out anything in the rule that prohibits the Committee on Appropriations from reporting upon a sundry civil bill or any other general appropriation bill a deficiency for the present fiscal year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I admit that deficiency appropriations are in order on this bill, but a deficiency appropriation can not be in order unless the service or compensation is already authorized by law. The gentleman from Illinois is proposing to legislate fixing the compensation. The compensation for these places is fixed by law for the current year.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And the appropriation has been made—

Mr. MANN. And has been fixed by law for the next fiscal year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The appropriation has been made to the extent of the law, and there can not be any deficiency.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman, it seems to me, fails to realize what the rule provides.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; I do not.

Mr. CANNON. Very well. I disagree with the gentleman. This amendment is authorized by the special rule. The original proposition is not authorized by law. It seems to me it is perfectly plain that the very object of the rule was to enable us to consider this amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, notwithstanding that it is not authorized by law. Very true this is not authorized by law, but it provides by this amendment to affect the same employees that are affected by the original amendment as offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. I do not know that it is necessary, if I may be indulged for a moment, to show the propriety of this amendment. If without amendment the gentleman from Tennessee succeeds in having the amendment agreed to, the increase of pay to the employees does not begin until the 1st of July next. God knows what the price of wheat, corn, and meats will be on the 1st day of July. We do not know when the war in Europe will close. It may be that the salaries proposed by the amendment by the gentleman from Tennessee will buy 25 or 50 per cent more of the necessities of life than the salaries would buy during the remainder of this fiscal year.

In my judgment, the rule makes this amendment in order. And even without the rule I believe this amendment to be germane. It treats of the same parties and the same officials that the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] covers.

Mr. MANN and Mr. BENNET rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, of course, is only under the special rule, and would not be in order, as the Chair rules, to strike out of the bill because it is an appropriation not authorized by law. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] provides for an increase in the compensation during the fiscal year 1918. If an item in the bill in some place provided for an appropriation for the fiscal year 1918 for a particular officer who was authorized by law, and there was a deficiency for this year, it would be in order to offer an amendment on this bill.

Now, the other appropriating committees frequently bring in bills providing that appropriations shall be immediately available. That language is always subject to a point of order because the other appropriating committees do not have jurisdiction over deficiencies, but the Committee on Appropriations does have jurisdiction over deficiencies, and an item making immediately available an appropriation carried in one of the bills reported from the Appropriations Committee, offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. I think it proper to call the attention of the Chair to the rule and also to a colloquy which took place in the House when the rule was proposed.

When the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] reported this rule from the Committee on Rules I asked him the distinct question whether an amendment of this character would be in order under the rule reported from that committee. Of course, while his opinion does not control the Chair, still it was upon his statement that the House acted. He said that such an amendment under the rule would be in order. I call the attention of the Chair to the rule:

Resolved, That no amendment shall be in order in the consideration of the foregoing amendment changing existing law beyond the fiscal year 1918.

Is the Committee on Rules trying to fool the House—I think not—by bringing in a rule stating that no amendment shall be in order beyond the fiscal year 1918? Are they endeavoring to fool the House into the belief that under that an amendment would be in order providing for any time between now and the end of the fiscal year 1918? I do not believe the Committee on Rules would be guilty of endeavoring to fool the House by bringing in such a rule. Here is a rule reported from the committee and adopted by the House which provides that no amend-

ment shall be in order relating to the time after June 30, 1918. Certainly that, by implication, provides that an amendment any time prior to that time would be in order, as expressly stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], who reported the rule. But the amendment is germane. If a similar item had been in the bill relating to the next fiscal year, any deficiency relating to the item would be in order on this bill or any other bill reported from the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman from Mississippi. [Laughter.]

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, after the remark which the Chairman just made, it is very much like the justice of the peace, who by vocation was a blacksmith, who heard all the testimony in a case, and told the lawyers who had examined the witnesses, "Now, you have a pretty good crowd here. Get up now and make your argument. I have got to go and do some work. Open up this drawer and you will find my written judgment. Do not lose this opportunity to make a speech."

So, inasmuch as the Chair has stated that he is ready to rule, I am rather in that attitude. Of course, there is no intimation as to which side of the question he is to rule on, and the gentleman now addressing the Chair is also in this unfortunate position, namely, that the gentleman occupying the Chair is a member of the Committee on Rules which reported the bill, and perhaps is in a better situation to understand what the Rules Committee had in mind at that time.

But I wanted to call the Chair's attention to the fact that this whole resolution provides for appropriation for a certain fiscal year. There is no item in the bill, no item in the amendment now offered, except for the fiscal year which is specifically set forth in the resolution, stating that this rule is for the purpose of making an item for the year, which the committee offered for the year 1918, in order. There is nothing in the rule, no line or syllable in the rule or in the body of the resolution, that provides for any other year than the fiscal year 1918.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman seriously contend that there is nothing in this bill applying to any fiscal year except the fiscal year 1918?

Mr. SISSON. Nothing in this rule, I say. In other words, if you take the wording of the rule—

Mr. MANN. What the gentleman said was "the bill."

Mr. SISSON. But take the rule—

Mr. MANN. I was speaking of the bill.

Mr. SISSON. The rule applies to the bill. The language of the rule is this—

Mr. MANN. I understand.

Mr. SISSON. I understand, but since the gentleman raised the question, I wanted him to understand what is in my own mind. It says:

That to provide during the fiscal year 1918 for increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate of compensation less than \$1,200.

That is for the year 1918. The resolving portion of the resolution, on page 2, limits it so that you can not get beyond the year 1918. But the appropriation here—

Mr. MANN. We are observing that, too.

Mr. SISSON. But the appropriation here in this bill does not cover the item for 1917. We are legislating only for 1918. Now, you might put upon this bill, if you please, items providing for salaries and fix the salaries, if you please, but it would be germane for all time to come until that salary was changed; but you are not doing that now. The only thing we are doing is making provisions for the salaries that shall be drawn during the year 1918. That is the specific appropriation. Now, the fact that you say that you shall not go beyond 1918 is a limitation only as to the future. It does not in anywise affect the law which this bill affects, to wit, that of appropriations commencing for the year 1918, and making appropriations for the year 1918 the rule only contemplates it would not go beyond the year 1918, and can not antedate that year. That is my contention under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the object of the special rule is to provide for these increases for certain classes of employees for the fiscal year 1918, and that if the proviso in the special rule cited by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], namely—

Resolved, That no amendment shall be in order in the consideration of the foregoing amendment changing existing law beyond the fiscal year 1918, nor shall any amendment be in order relating to the compensation of employees not appropriated for in H. R. 18542—

were not in the special rule, an amendment would not be in order that would have extended it beyond the fiscal year 1918. It would not, in that event, be germane to this section. There

is quite a difference, in the opinion of the Chair, between an amendment making an appropriation immediately available and in an amendment that provides for increasing the appropriation during the remainder of the year 1917. The Chair can not agree with the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that there is any deficiency to be taken care of in this amendment. It proposes, on the other hand, to increase an appropriation and change existing law. The amendment, in the opinion of the Chair, is not germane to the provision and sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois appeals from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the committee?

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers. I do that so that the Chair will not be put to the embarrassment of counting.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Illinois asks for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GLASS). The gentleman from Illinois asks for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. MANN and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee to act as tellers.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 96, noes 79.

The CHAIRMAN. The decision of the Chair is sustained. [Applause.]

Mr. KEATING and Mr. BORLAND rose.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HARRISON). The gentleman from Missouri is a member of the committee. The gentleman from Colorado will be recognized later.

Mr. KEATING. I had the assurance of the Chair, as the Chair knows, that I would be recognized, and I feel under all the circumstances that the Chair should make good on the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that under the practice here the members of the committee will have the prior right.

Mr. KEATING. Is it possible, Mr. Chairman, that when a Member has been struggling for the floor for the better part of an hour a member of the committee, who has an eleventh-hour inspiration, can come in and take him off the floor? Can the thing continue without limit?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state to the gentleman that it does seem to be unfair, but he will recognize the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. Sisson. I believe it is the rule of the committee and not simply a practice.

Mr. BORLAND. It is not in the discretion of the Chair. I offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BORLAND: Page 142, line 18, after the word "employees," insert the words "including the Capitol police and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the point of order is well taken, because the rule under which the original amendment was offered provides that it shall extend only to employees covered by this bill. An amendment which included employees not covered by this bill would be subject to a point of order, but these employees are covered in this bill, and in no other bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman this question: Are these employees that the gentleman proposes to include in this section provided for in this bill?

Mr. BORLAND. They are provided for in this bill. There is no question about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered simply applies to the employees covered in the bill. I think it is specifically stated in the rule that it shall apply only "to the employees of the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, and the executive and judicial establishments who are appropriated for in this act specifically and under lump sums or whose employment is authorized herein." The rule reported

by the Committee on Rules and adopted by the House provides—

That no amendment shall be in order in the consideration of the foregoing amendment changing existing law beyond the fiscal year 1918, nor shall any amendment be in order relating to the compensation of employees not appropriated for in H. R. 18542.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I only want to say this, that it seems to me that the same reasoning which applies to a raise of 10 per cent to employees drawing less than \$1,200, on account of living conditions here in Washington or on account of living conditions throughout the country at the present time, would apply with the same force to the employees of the House, with the same force to the Capitol police, and to the watchmen and doorkeepers and others who must live here in Washington and under the same conditions of living.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. These employees covered in the amendment will all have a vacation from the 4th of March until the 15th of December on half pay.

A MEMBER. Full pay.

Mr. GORDON. That is so much worse. Why do you say this would apply to these clerks in Washington that would apply to these appointees?

Mr. BORLAND. I will answer the gentleman. This bill is for the fiscal year 1918. It has nothing to do with the 4th of March. It goes into operation on the 1st day of July, 1917. It embraces the long session of Congress, beginning in December, 1917, and extending probably, as we know, during the balance of that fiscal year. During the time from the 1st of July until the convening of Congress most of these employees will be engaged. A large number of them certainly will be engaged. The men in the folding room, the men in the various clerical offices here, the Capitol police, all of them will be engaged. There will be scarcely any vacation, and so far as I am able to ascertain, the expenses of these men in going back and forth to and from their homes for a short vacation are a part of their expenses, and they do not get any opportunity to engage in other business. The vacation, in other words, does not result in any addition to their pay.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BORLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SIMS. Does this amendment cover those employees in the House Office Building who are under the Superintendent of the Capitol, who are carried on the pay rolls of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. BORLAND. I intended that it should cover them.

Mr. SIMS. It ought to.

Mr. BORLAND. And if the gentleman is not clear about it, let him offer an amendment to cover it.

Mr. SIMS. Oh, I want the gentleman to cover it.

Mr. BORLAND. My impression is that the description "employees of the House and Senate" embraces them all.

Mr. SIMS. These gentlemen to whom I refer are on the pay roll of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BORLAND. If they are on the pay roll of the Secretary of the Interior they are embraced in the main proposition. Now, what we are trying to embrace is those who are not on the pay rolls of any of the executive departments, but who are on the pay rolls of the legislative department.

Mr. SIMS. That is my understanding.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island. Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri, and I want to ask him if his amendment includes the folders in the House Office Building?

Mr. BORLAND. It does. It covers all of these low-paid employees.

Mr. BURNETT. Will it include the messengers to committees?

Mr. BORLAND. I think so.

Mr. BURNETT. I think it is very just that they should be included. I have a messenger who gets only \$60 a month, a white man, a very competent man, and I am going to lose him unless something is done to increase his salary.

Mr. BORLAND. That only emphasizes what I have to say. It is a question of simple justice. I concur with the committee in believing that if we give an increase at all in the pay of the great army of Government employees, we ought to be very moderate in the increase. We ought not to be swept off our feet by some proposition to increase them 25 or 33 per cent, or some such increase that we can not justify according to the increase of industrial wages throughout the country; but when

we give an increase of even 10 per cent, I think we ought to be perfectly uniform about it, and I think it ought to embrace all the employees who receive these low salaries, and whose conditions of employment are similar. Therefore, I think we ought to adopt this, in common fairness, if we adopt any provision increasing the salaries of employees.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman absolutely certain that under his amendment all would be included?

Mr. BORLAND. I am not absolutely certain, but I would like to make it certain that the increase would be uniform.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] proposes to offer an amendment which would make that absolutely certain. This bill divides itself into various branches under the titles "Legislative," "Executive," and "Judicial."

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee uses the language "executive and judicial establishments." If you add "legislative," then you include everybody covered by the bill; but when you attempt to cut out the general term "legislative" and to specify certain things, I do not know whether you cover them all or not. The gentleman from Pennsylvania proposes to offer an amendment to strike out the words "Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, and the" and to insert "legislative," so that it would apply to the employees of the legislative, executive, and judicial establishments who are appropriated for in this bill. That covers everybody whose salaries come within the limits covered by the proposition.

Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman will yield, I suppose it would be a good thing to say that this increase shall apply to all employees appropriated for in this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. You will find on the second page of the bill the heading "Legislative." That covers every appropriation for the legislative establishment of the Government. You will find on page 28 the heading "Executive." That covers all the appropriations for the executive establishments of the Government. You will find on page 137 the heading "Judicial." That is the heading that covers all the appropriations under the judicial establishment, and the three combined cover all. Now, that is a simpler way to do it, I think, and not leave it a matter of construction as to whether certain employees under the Superintendent of the Capitol are covered, and so forth.

Mr. BORLAND. Would that cover the Capitol police?

Mr. MANN. They are all appropriated for under the legislative establishment.

Mr. BORLAND. I personally have no objection to that amendment. I want to cover exactly what the gentleman from Illinois has outlined. I think we ought to make this raise uniform within those limits of salary.

Mr. MANN. I think whatever we do to-day ought to apply to all the employees of the Government, here and elsewhere.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, I wish to ask him whether he has any objection to accepting an amendment, which I shall send to the desk to be read for information. The idea is to cover all of those that would be affected by the bill.

Mr. BORLAND. I will yield to the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Pages 142 and 143, after the words "employees of the," in line 24, strike out the words "Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, and the" and insert in lieu thereof the word "legislative."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That would make it comprehensive and cover everyone that is to be covered in this bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would not that be broad enough to cover the various committees of the House and the Senate and the clerks of Members whose compensation has already been increased?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It covers all those receiving not more than \$1,800 and not less than \$1,200.

Mr. BARKLEY. It covers employees whose compensation has been increased under previous action.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think not; it would apply as in other cases.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The clerks to Members are not employed under the legislative establishment, but are the employees of Members. Mr. BARKLEY. But it would cover clerks to committees.

Mr. MANN. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask leave to modify my amendment on the lines suggested and carefully analyzed by the clerk of the committee. I want to move to amend so as to strike out the words in line 24, page 142, after the word "employees," extending down to the word "establishment," in line 2, page 140. That strikes out all reference to the Library of Congress, Botanic Garden, executive, and judicial. And it would read: "Provided, That this section shall only apply to the employees who are appropriated for in this act specifically and under lump sums or whose employment is authorized therein." That amendment is absolutely clear.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That covers everybody intended to be covered in the executive and judicial departments?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; it covers what the gentleman has in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BORLAND: Pages 142 and 143, after the word "employees," in line 24, page 142, strike out the words "of the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, and the executive and judicial establishments," so as to make the line read as follows: "This section shall apply only to the employees who are appropriated for in this act specifically and under lump sums," etc.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the committee should understand why the employees of the Senate and House were not included in the recommendation by the Committee on Appropriations. It was due to the fact that the compensation of employees of the two Houses of Congress is not only liberal but very generous and much in excess of that paid for similar services in any department of the Government or in private life. An employee who is engaged in the business of operating an elevator in the Capitol or the House Office Building receives \$1,200 a year. In private establishments in the city they receive \$60 a month, and \$720 a year as a rule in the executive departments of the Government. The page boys employed on the floor of the House receive \$75 a month. Compensation for other services is on a similar scale.

I do not criticize the scale, because it is something inherent in the conduct of legislative bodies. The employment is not of a permanent character; it is what may be termed somewhat hazardous in that it is apt to terminate unexpectedly and without much notice. And so the custom exists in every legislative body of the United States to compensate upon a generous scale their employees. When it is proposed to give an increase to take care of temporary conditions those facts can not be ignored.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The salaries for the employees around the Capitol have been carried for a number of years at practically the same amount?

Mr. FITZGERALD. A great many of them.

Mr. MANN. Congress having now acted on the idea that these salaries were proper at that time, if an emergency does exist does not the emergency hit these employees just as hard as it does any other employees?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They are as well off relatively and much better off than anybody else relatively.

Mr. MANN. Considering the fact that many will go out in the cold before long, does not the gentleman think that this should apply to them?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not think that many will go out at the close of this Congress. It is a matter that affects Members on this side of the House by whom they are appointed. If any of the employees of the Capitol are dissatisfied because of the compensation they are receiving and no longer desire the places, if I am given an opportunity I can bring a regiment of applicants, competent persons, who are not only willing but very anxious to fill the places. What I have said, Mr. Chairman, is simply in explanation of the action of the committee in eliminating these employees. It was the desire of the committee to try and meet as far as could be the needs of employees of the Government under existing conditions.

Consideration had to be given to many things. I have just had a computation made by competent persons, and their estimate is that if a provision similar to the one carried in this bill is incorporated in every appropriation bill it will require \$25,000,000 to meet the added expense to the Government. It seems to me that that is as far as we are justified in going under the present circumstances. While I am willing to be

just, I am not willing to be lavish in attempting to take care of the situation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I received a letter this morning which seems to me to contain a most effective argument in favor of the general proposition properly to increase the wages of Government employees. This letter was written by the postmaster in a city of about 15,000 people in my district, and, with the permission of the House, I shall now read it:

DECEMBER 16, 1916.

MY DEAR Mr. COOPER: I wish to write you about a circumstance that has happened here and the condition that exists. We have here at this building a janitor who receives \$55 per month. He is 55 years of age and has a family. He is a handy man, is a pretty fair mechanic. He does many odd jobs of repairs that if he did not do would cost the Government a considerable amount to have done. He has had sickness in his family, and has been ailing himself because of a nervous disorder, induced, I think, by his financial condition. Yesterday he would have destroyed himself had the gun which he was about to use not been taken away from him—

Mr. Chairman, I ask for order. It is true that this is merely the case of a janitor who is being paid \$55 a month; but, nevertheless, he is entitled to have his case presented here inasmuch as he is only one of quite a large class of Government employees who are trying to exist—forced to exist—in these times of extravagant prices on what are practically starvation wages. For the benefit of gentlemen who apparently did not wish to hear the letter I shall repeat some of what I have read:

Yesterday he would have destroyed himself had the gun which he was about to use not been taken away from him. This man can not reasonably support himself, or even support himself at all, on \$55 a month.

I do not write you to urge any legislation, but simply to acquaint you with a condition that exists here and, I think, in many other places.

As a citizen I have to say that, in my judgment, the Government ought to pay a living wage to even its most humble employees, and, further, in my judgment, such legislation ought to be enacted as would permit or require the payment in these times of high prices of a larger amount to janitors.

I beg to remain,

Yours, very sincerely,

Then follows the signature of the postmaster.

This is the richest Government in the world, Mr. Chairman, and in times like these it is not justified in compelling an employee with wife and children dependent upon him for support, for whom he is obliged to buy food and fuel and clothing and to pay physicians, as this sick man has been, to try to exist on \$55 per month. Gentlemen have repeatedly said that the Government must be just before it is generous. Mr. Chairman, it must be just before it is niggardly. [Applause.] I have not a constituent, I am thankful to say, but who, if it should become necessary for the Government to raise money by bonds in order properly to pay janitors in these times, will not consent to the issue of bonds.

As I have before said on this floor, the Government ought not to determine its duty by what private employers sometimes do in the matter of wages, but it ought to make itself a model employer, as it is abundantly able to do, and always pay all of its employees a living wage. [Applause.]

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] and now under discussion may or may not be understood clearly by the membership of the House. The purpose of the amendment is to include in this increase of pay the employees of the two branches of Congress; no one else. Every other person appropriated for in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill is provided for in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. I want to call the attention particularly of the majority side of this House to the fact that these men hold their positions largely as patronage at their hands. They are paid a wage sufficient to induce them, many of them, to come from your districts to the Capital to accept this job. There is not a single man of you who has one of these places at your disposal who can not to-day fill the place of any man you have named five times over by men who are beseeching you for the place. [Applause.] And yet you stand here seriously considering squandering the public money in order that these men who work little more than half the time, may have a bonus paid to them on a wage that they are not only glad to have, but that 40 other men are standing at your elbow to take away from them, if you shall designate them.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. I will ask the gentleman whether that is not exactly true of every other employee in the bill whose pay is raised? Is not that exactly the fact in the case of all these employees?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Except that possibly the person out of employment who would take the place of the employee in the Government service can not take it because of the civil-service obstacle that is in his way; but that is not true in the case of these employees.

Mr. BORLAND. Is there not a big civil-service waiting list now?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Oh, certainly; and I might argue that, in support of the moderate increase that has been provided in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. I have no hesitation in saying, and it can be proven by the most reliable figures that have been tabulated in respect to a comparison between the wages paid clerical employees by the Government and those salaries paid in private employment for like service, and in every instance a fair comparison will show that the very people for whom we are providing an increase of 5 or 10 per cent under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee are receiving greater pay than are men who are performing not only a like service but who work much longer hours in private employment.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] alludes to the "richest Government on earth." How long would we be so if we pursued the course marked out by some gentlemen? The gentleman is consistently willing that we should increase these wages, even if we issue bonds to meet the increased amount. This is temporary, but we must pay for it by additional taxation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I can not yield just now.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman wants to be fair?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I want to be fair.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I feared it possible that the gentleman might put that construction upon my remarks. I limited that specifically to the increased wages of janitors.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It would not take many bonds to do that.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I said my constituents, if they had to do it in order to pay these poor men more than \$55 a month—

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I accept the gentleman's statement, because I value the time more than my statement. I want to say this one thing further in connection with this matter: Other gentlemen have alluded to this as being the "richest Government on earth." You can not get your money except out of the people by taxation, and I want to say there are gentlemen in this House, some on this side and more on the other side, who have voted for every expenditure that has been proposed, but who refused to vote for the bill raising the amount necessary to pay it, and I say that in good faith, whatever may be your political affiliation, you can not afford to vote obligations upon the Government and then refuse to vote for the money that is necessary to pay them; and that is what you are doing here in this proposition. [Applause.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I belong to that committee which is charged with the duty of suggesting bills to this House to pay the tremendous expenses of this Government. The London Economist five or six weeks ago contained a most interesting article estimating the amount of the budgets of the warring nations after the present awful war is ended. If the war ends one year from the 1st of next March, England will have an annual budget thereafter of \$1,200,000,000, according to this publication. Germany will have a budget of \$1,300,000,000; Austria-Hungary will have a budget of \$1,400,000,000; Russia, with a budget always the largest in the world, will have a budget of \$1,600,000,000. I wonder if gentlemen who compose this body realize that for the year mentioned by the London Economist, for the fiscal year 1918, the expenses of this Government—and we have been in no war—will be \$1,655,000,000, the largest budget in all the world, a larger budget than any nation in the world was ever compelled to meet. Increase the salaries of all these Government employees 10 per cent and you add to the expenses of this Government \$60,000,000 every year. How are you going to meet it? The cry all over this country is, "Cut out the 'pork'!" and by "pork" they mean appropriations for public buildings; by "pork" they mean appropriations for rivers and harbors; by "pork" they mean appropriations for this Government's distribution of vegetable seed, and that is all. The average annual expenditure for public buildings for the last two decades amounted to \$9,000,000. We spend \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 on rivers and harbors every year. Cut this out, cut both out, cut out the \$250,000 which is expended for vegetable

seed each year and you would have half of what these 500,000 Government employees are seeking to saddle on this country. I am not willing to see our rivers and harbors permitted to fill up nor to discontinue entirely the expenditure of money for Government buildings in order that Government employees may have their demands on the Treasury satisfied. The real pork-barrel propositions with which this country is confronted are the demands of these Government employees on the Treasury. We have a deficiency staring us in the face. Gentlemen need not deny it.

The deficiency in 1918 will amount to nearly \$280,000,000. How are you gentlemen going to meet that when the time comes? Is the country going dry? Those who advocate nation-wide prohibition are boasting of the fact that Pennsylvania and Nevada are now the only really wet States in the Union. I am not discussing the moral question, but I am discussing the condition which will confront us when this country does go dry. If that should happen during the next year—an impossible premise, though—we will be called upon by taxation to collect from some source or other \$237,000,000 more in money each year thereafter. In other words, we are confronted right now in this country with the possibility of being compelled in the near future to levy more than \$500,000,000 of new taxes. How are you going to do it? Restore the rates of the Payne-Aldrich bill? That is the proposal many of you make. You can not, to save your life, frame a tariff bill which will yield over \$350,000,000 a year. Restore those oppressive rates and you will add to the present tariff law \$100,000,000 in tariff taxes. If you restore this obnoxious stamp tax, you have only \$33,000,000 more. Can you get it from taxing the large incomes more? Why, you have in this method of taxing reached the very highest notch. We tax large incomes now as much as any other civilized nation in the world ever attempted to tax them in time of peace. You are face to face with the necessity of lowering the income exemption—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that the gentleman from Illinois proceed for five minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAINEY. We are face to face with the proposition of lowering the income exemption to \$1,000, and even if you do that also you will not raise this enormous sum of money. You can not progress here by proceeding along the line of least resistance. You can not conceal your head in the sand and flounder around here helplessly listening to the demands of 500,000 Government employees who want their salaries raised.

I wish we could raise their salaries. I wish we could pay everybody more money. I wish this janitor mentioned by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Cooper] could get more money than he is receiving now. Is he getting any more or any less than janitors receive for similar service in other sections of this country and in private employment? If he is getting less, he ought to have more; if he is getting more, he ought to have less. That is the way to adjust these matters. How much is he getting? He is getting \$55 a month, perhaps also apartments in which to live, with the tips that go with services of that kind in a great city—\$600 per year. That is not a large amount, but it is \$100 more than the average rate of wages paid in the gentleman's district, the gentleman who suggests now the monstrous proposition that we issue bonds for the purpose of paying the current expenses of this Government in order that these salaries may be raised.

Mr. SIMS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMS. I fully agree with what the gentleman says, but is it not a fact that the estimates for military and naval expenditures this year are \$300,000,000 more than they were last year?

Mr. RAINEY. That is exactly true.

Mr. SIMS. And all the world talking peace and permanent peace.

Mr. RAINEY. And when we discuss lowering those expenditures for the Army and Navy, from every metropolitan paper in this country comes the charge that we are guilty of treason against this Government. You can not lower those estimates.

Mr. DALLINGER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he did not vote on the fish hatcheries bill—

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; I did.

Mr. DALLINGER (continuing). Carrying \$800,000?

Mr. RAINEY. I voted for the fish hatcheries bill. They add largely to the wealth of this country. I voted for those hatch-

eries because they help provide food for the 100,000,000 people who live in this country. [Applause.] We have one river in Illinois which, under the fish-hatchery system conducted there, yields every year per acre for all the land in its bed which is covered with water, \$15. Is not that an industry worthy of being taken care of? Is any private individual going to hatch out fish and turn them out for fishermen to catch, when they mature, in our streams in order to reduce the high cost of living in this country?

These Government positions do not go begging. Last year we had 185,000 applicants for these places. Six times as many people took every examination as there were jobs to distribute. They are desirable places. I wish it were possible to pay them more money. I wish it were possible to pay every wage earner in this country more money—every man who works upon a small salary more money. In this country there are 6,600,000 men who work all day long amid clanking machinery, in the close air of great factories, who received on an average in 1909—the last year for which reliable statistics are available—\$519 per year. If their salaries have been increased since then by 20 per cent, which is hardly possible, they would get less now than this janitor gets. The farmers of this country who produce foodstuffs for this Nation enjoy an average income of less than \$600 per year, and that includes what their wives and children are able by their labor to contribute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. May I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINEY. Employees here in the District of Columbia work seven and a half hours a day, some of them, and some of them work eight hours a day—none of them more than that—and they receive an average compensation of \$1,200 per year. Two millions of these wage earners in our factories, who get an average wage of less than \$600 per year, work over 10 hours a day, and only 500,000 of them work 8 hours or less. The remaining 6,100,000 work 10 hours and more than that every day.

How much time are they allowed each year on full pay for sick leave? They do not get 30 days. How much time are they allowed for vacations on full pay? They do not get 30 days. All these Government employees get 30 days' sick leave and 30 days' vacation on full pay all the time. These Government positions are desirable ones. They are sought after. You need not fear that they are not going to be filled. The humanitarian side of the question, of course, appeals to all of us. We would like to give them more money if we could, but this money in the Treasury does not belong to us. The Republican side usually votes for every charge on the Treasury, and gets enough votes on the Democratic side to carry it through. The money you are spending does not belong to you. It belongs to the 100,000,000 people who are being taxed to place it there. It does not flutter down from heaven to fill up these vaults of the Treasury. It is there as a result of a system of taxation. We are not here for the purpose of generously giving it away. We are here as trustees of this enormous fund for the people who sent us here, to protect their rights, and not to give it away to Government employees who want their salaries increased. The time has not come to increase salaries, as many gentlemen in this House think they ought to be increased. But the time will come when everyone of us will be compelled to go home and face our constituents. You can not escape responsibility because you sit on that side of this aisle and say that we on this side are responsible because we have control of this House, and Democrats can not escape responsibility, either. This trust fund must be administered conscientiously and not given away. Of course, these employees want their salaries raised. We know they do. They hold every day meetings in this city, here where \$46,000,000 in Government funds are distributed every year in salaries, here where there are 42,000 Government employees. They hold their meetings here every day, creating a public sentiment, a tremendous sentiment among themselves, for this increase. And it is announced that a petition to contain 500,000 names is about to be presented to this Congress, asking that we boost these salaries until we make an additional charge on the Treasury on account of this subject alone of \$60,000,000 per year.

Already here in this committee—and I am unwilling to believe the propositions will ever pass the House—you have increased your allowances. You have given yourselves session stenographers at \$75 a month, and you have increased your allowance for clerical hire to \$2,000. You insist these additions are necessary, because you have to pay some of these expenses out of your pockets. Of course we all do that. But those of you

who represent country districts, how many third-class postmasters have you got who do not pay something out of the pittance that the Government gives them to conduct the Government's business and employ additional help in their offices? Why, nearly every one of them does, and we are not here demanding that their allowances be increased. And if you increase your allowances here you will simply take the lid off the Treasury of the United States and invite every Government employee to come in here and help himself.

The time has come when the taxpayers of this country, the men who meet these enormous burdens, ought to be consulted. Every day bill after bill is introduced into this House for the purpose of getting money out of the Treasury. But I can count on the fingers of one hand the bills which Members introduce here in a whole session of Congress for the purpose of getting money into the Treasury. What we need in this country is some method of getting money into the Treasury, not so many heroic, patriotic methods of getting money out. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I can not quite agree with all of the argument of my colleague [Mr. RAINEY] against the Byrns amendment. I think the Byrns amendment ought to be agreed to, and that the pending amendment ought also to be agreed to.

Just for a moment let us see what the situation is in the country. Since the war in Europe began we have imported more than a thousand million dollars of gold. That of itself would add considerably to the cost of articles and help very materially to make prosperity in the country, because no country in the history of the world ever yet has imported great quantities of gold without prosperous times following the importation. We are exporting immense quantities of munitions of war, foodstuffs, cotton, and so forth, at very high prices, at prices which benefit us, so far as the Nation is concerned, because they are prices which are paid by the foreigner for the articles which we export. The result is that the country is enjoying prosperous conditions; business is doing well; labor is in demand. There is almost an extravagant riot of speculation going on in some parts of the country as the result of these prosperous conditions. But the very result hits most people in the country hard. A few enjoy the splendid benefits of the prosperity, but the man who works for a salary finds that if he had a steady job before, the prosperity of the country ruins his personal prosperity. Instead of all receiving the benefit, those who work are at a disadvantage unless their wages be enlarged.

Most of the private companies and persons who are employers in the land have either willingly or unwillingly been required to advance the wages of their employees. The demand for labor itself would cause that, whether the employers desired it or not. Many of the large corporations have, in addition to raising the wages of their employees, given a bonus at the end of the year or at the end of some time to their employees.

Now, we stand in a peculiar position. It is dependent upon us whether we will at all increase the compensation of Government employees, or whether we will determine that the prosperity which may come to all other people in the country shall be calamity to those who are employed in the service of the Government of the United States. [Applause.] That is what we have to determine. They can not receive the benefit of the prosperity except through our influence. Shall we make it a calamity to them because it spells prosperity to everybody else?

I take it that whatever we do on this bill ought to be followed on the other appropriating bills providing for governmental service. Whatever rate we fix here we ought to fix in other bills, providing for the same classes of service with the same increase of pay. If we do not increase compensation here on this bill, we ought not to increase compensation on the other bills. If we add 10 per cent here to the pay of those who receive less than \$1,200 a year, we ought to add 10 per cent to all the other Government employees, because the calamity or the prosperity is not coextensive with the limits of the District of Columbia. The same conditions exist throughout the Union. We must determine now, in order not to play favorites, whether we will increase and to what extent we will increase the pay of Government employees; and we ought to carry that through the various other appropriations which are to come.

Now, I fail to understand the reasoning of those gentlemen who believe that we ought to increase the pay of everybody in the Government service below a certain salary except those that we personally know, who do the personal work for us in the House and the official work here; that we ought to increase the pay of all the Government clerks in Washington and the Government clerks in the post offices and other branches of the Government service throughout the Union everywhere, ex-

cept the janitor who does the work in our own employ. I fail to understand that reasoning. If we are to be generous—I do not say generous, because I do not think we ought to be generous—but, in any event, if we would be reasonably just, then we ought to apply that to those who work for us here as well as the others, and not draw the line.

I do not believe that we ought to make a great increase in the pay. I commend the committee, which, having a very difficult task before it, finally brought in the proposition which was brought in. I am inclined to think at present that the percentage of increase they propose may be a proper percentage for us to follow all through the Government service. I do not favor extravagant appropriations. We may have the burden on this side before long—probably will [applause on the Republican side]—of raising the money. We know that the other side has always proved incompetent to transact such business. [Applause on the Republican side.] We know that they do not know how to raise money for the Government. We believe that if we have the power we will have the knowledge and the statesmanship to do it properly. I think we will have, and that we can afford to be just to those who work for the Government, as much so as to those who work for private employers, and that we ought here to determine a reasonable increase in pay and apply it to all employees of the Government in the classes covered as we may cover them in any proposition that we may adopt here and now. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, there are other amendments to follow, and I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending amendment be now closed.

Mr. AUSTIN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. AUSTIN. I have been trying all the morning to get the Chairman's eye, and I object to closing the debate on this amendment until I have had an opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. To my certain knowledge the gentleman has an amendment which I know he proposes to offer a little later.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have been on my feet very often, trying to get recognition all the morning, and I do not propose to be cut off.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there are several gentlemen trying to get recognition, but he can not recognize them all at the same time. He is doing the best he can.

Mr. KEATING. Can we not dispose of the Borland amendment?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think we ought to dispose of this amendment and then take up the main proposition. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending amendment be closed in 10 minutes, 5 minutes to go to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment be limited to 10 minutes, 5 of which shall be allotted to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] and 5 to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to address myself for a few minutes to the manner in which we can raise this needed money, in answer to the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

Just prior to the adjournment of the last session of Congress two speeches were made on this floor when the revenue bill was under consideration, one by the Speaker of this House and the other by the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means. As I now recall the speech made by Speaker CLARK he stated that he had served on the Ways and Means Committee for 15 or 16 years, and that he could take the schedules in the tariff bill and write a tariff measure which would produce a sufficient amount of money to meet all the Government requirements. The ranking Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. FORDNEY] stated during the same debate that if the Payne-Aldrich tariff rates were now in force, with the present large importations of foreign goods into this country we would collect enough money at our customhouses to meet all the running expenses of the National Government without a resort to direct taxation.

Our present tariff duties average about 10 per cent, the lowest in the world. If you double the existing tariff rates you can raise a sufficient amount of money to take care of all these appropriation bills. So there is your remedy and your method for meeting this proposed increase in salaries.

We have not had a rearrangement or readjustment or general increase in Government salaries for half a century. We

have increased the salaries of the judges of the Supreme Court, we have increased the salaries of every United States circuit and district judge, we have increased the salaries of the President and the members of the Cabinet. Ten years ago, on account of the increase in the cost of living, the Members of this House increased their own salaries 50 per cent. The United States Steel Corporation has already increased the wages of its 200,000 employees to the extent of \$30,000,000, and on Saturday last the American Bell Telephone Co. announced an increase of \$3,000,000 for its employees. Other corporations throughout the country have increased wages. Everybody admits the increased cost of living. What fair, just, and reasonable argument can be made against increasing the salaries of the efficient and deserving Government officials? Why, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINES] in a 15-minute speech argued against the increase of Government salaries, and yet when the eight-hour proposition was before this House last session, which, according to the officials of the railroad companies, meant an increase in wages of 25 per cent, he voted for it. If that increase is to be met, freight rates will be advanced, and in the end the people are to pay for the increase.

This increase reported by the Committee on Appropriations is a delusion and a snare. It means a daily increase of 21 cents for a \$1,600 clerk, a daily increase of 18 cents for a \$1,400 clerk, 20 cents a day for a \$900 clerk, 25 cents a day for a messenger at \$840, and 21 cents a day increase for an assistant engineer, a watchman, or janitor, or skilled laborer. For a fireman on a salary of \$660 it means a daily increase of 19 cents; for a messenger at \$600 a year, 18 cents a day; for a charwoman at \$360 a year 10 cents a day; and for one at \$240 a year, 7 cents a day. The last increase will pay the price of a loaf of bread.

The weekly increase of a clerk at \$1,600 a year will be \$1.50 a week or \$6 a month. For a \$1,400 clerk it will mean a weekly increase of \$1.25, or a monthly increase of \$5. For a \$900 clerk it will mean a weekly increase of \$1.87, a monthly increase of \$7.50. For an \$840 messenger it will mean a weekly increase of \$1.75 and a monthly increase of \$7. For an assistant engineer, a watchman, a janitor, a skilled laborer, all receiving the same wage, it will mean a weekly increase of \$1.50, a monthly increase of \$6. For a fireman paid \$660 annually it will mean a monthly increase of \$5.50 or a weekly increase of \$1.37, while a \$600 messenger will get a monthly raise of \$5 or a weekly increase of \$1.25. A charwoman paid \$360 would obtain a monthly advance of \$3 or 75 cents per week. The lowest-paid charwoman, who now receives \$240 for a year's work, will get the magnificent increase of \$2 per month or 50 cents per week.

I have worked out this proposed increase under the pending bill to show that this so-called salary increase to meet the high cost of living is practically a delusion, and would be a reflection rather than a credit on this great lawmaking body in doing its duty toward the honest, capable, deserving officials of this great Government. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the time. I will say what I want to say later.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee) there were—ayes 75, noes 61.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee and Mr. BORLAND.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 121, noes 65.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KEATING: On page 142, after the word "of," in the eighteenth line, strike out "10" and insert "20"; and, in line 20, strike out the figure "5" and insert "10."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it is possible to limit the debate upon this amendment? How much time does the gentleman from Colorado want?

Mr. KEATING. I want about 15 minutes, but there are several gentlemen here who want to discuss it, I imagine.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all time on the pending amendment be limited to 40 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. That is not sufficient. If the gentleman will bear with me, this involves an increase in rates.

Mr. MANN. But there may be somebody else that may propose an increase of rates, and we ought to get through with this bill to-day.

Mr. KEATING. Oh, we will get through with it.

Mr. MANN. Not at this rate.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will ask that all time on the pending amendment be limited to one hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment be limited to one hour. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I think a word with regard to the origin of this amendment would be in order at the very beginning. This amendment was agreed upon by a committee representing the various organizations into which the Federal employees have grouped themselves, working in conjunction with a volunteer committee of Members of Congress, of which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VAN DYKE] was chairman. The effect of the amendment is to increase the wages of employees who are receiving less than \$1,200 20 per cent, and to increase the wages of those receiving from \$1,200 up to \$1,800 10 per cent, and it provides no increase for those who receive wages above \$1,800.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Was the committee that met and determined the action that the House will take composed of Members of Congress or unofficial persons?

Mr. KEATING. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that he may possess his soul in peace. No body of citizens presumed to meet and dictate the action of this House, but a committee representing the Federal employees met, as they had a perfect right to do, and suggested to Congress and the Members thereof certain increases of salary rendered necessary by a state of affairs well known to exist.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman said they agreed on this schedule.

Mr. KEATING. They agreed upon it, and I agreed upon it; but I did not attempt to bind the gentleman from Ohio. I would not assume to do that.

Mr. GORDON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. KEATING. The amendment doubles the rates provided for in the amendment submitted by the Committee on Appropriations. Let me repeat: The 20 per cent increase is for employees who draw salaries up to but not including \$1,200, and 10 per cent from \$1,200 up to and including \$1,800, but no increase beyond \$1,800.

Mr. EVANS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I will.

Mr. EVANS. Ten per cent on a salary of \$1,700 is an increase of \$170. That carries the salary above \$1,800.

Mr. KEATING. The increase would include a salary of \$1,800, but would not apply to any salary which at the time of the passage of the law was above \$1,800.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. A clerk receiving \$1,100 gets an increase of 20 per cent, and he would receive more than the clerk who receives \$1,200 would get by an increase of 10 per cent.

Mr. KEATING. I have no doubt that here and there such results would be achieved, but I think in any method of percentage increase you may adopt you can work out such results. Only a few will be affected.

Now, as to the amendment, it increases the salaries for one year, the fiscal year of 1918. It does not increase the salaries for 1917 or 1919.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have 15 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman is mistaken, Mr. Chairman. The time was limited to an hour and left in control of the Chair. I would be glad if the gentleman from Colorado gets additional time, but I do not want the Chair to be misled.

Mr. KEATING. I did not intend to mislead the Chair.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course not.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time of the gentleman from Colorado be extended 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS). The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Colorado be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. The increase applies to the year 1918 and not to any other year. The need for the increase is just as urgent for 1917 as it will be for 1918, and therefore if you grant this increase you are practically granting a bonus covering two years—1917 and 1918.

Now, I wish to quote from a report by the Secretary of Commerce, his last annual report, to show the need of this increase. The Secretary says:

The following compilation has interest in connection with the facts relating to the cost of living of Government employees in Washington. The present scale of wages for clerks in the Government service, grouping them into four classes and fixing a salary of \$1,800, \$1,600, \$1,400, and \$1,200, respectively, per annum for each of these classes, was fixed by the act of Congress approved April 22, 1854 (10 Stat., 276; sec. 167, Rev. Stat.), and has not been changed since that time. For the subclerical grades the rates of compensation were fixed by the acts of Congress approved July 23, 1866 (14 Stat., 207; sec. 167, Rev. Stat.), and July 12, 1860 (14 Stat., 250; sec. 160, Rev. Stat.).

For 60 years the rates of compensation to clerks have remained stationary and for about 46 years to the subclerical grades. The available figures on file in the Bureau of Labor Statistics, based upon wages in selected industries, all of which, however, were not uniform for the entire period covered, but which can be accepted as typical, show an increase in daily average wage of 137.4 per cent from 1854 to 1915. In other words, daily wages in 1915 were 24 times as much as in 1854. These figures were taken from Senate Report No. 1394, Fifty-second Congress, second session, Report of Senate Finance Committee on Wholesale Prices, Wages, and Transportation, which, on page 176, gives the average wage increase to 1891; Bulletin No. 77 of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which, on page 7, gives the average wage scale from 1891 to 1907; and Bulletin No. 194 of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which, on page 20, gives the average wage scale from 1907 to 1915.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I wish to call attention to the fact that there have been changes in this way—that places at higher salaries have been created which people have been put into that were formerly not in the \$1,800 class. The Secretary did not know that fact when he incorporated those remarks into his report.

Mr. KEATING. Clerks have been promoted from one grade to another, I know. The Secretary's statement does not mean that a clerk who went into the service in 1854 is to-day, if he is in the service, at the same salary.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not mean that. What I mean is that there have been places created at salaries of \$2,000, \$2,200, and \$2,250 which are occupied by men who formerly never received more than \$1,800.

Mr. KEATING. I am glad to have the explanation. Now, the Secretary goes on and gives some interesting figures on the increase in cost of living during that same period:

The reports on cost of living show that for the same period, 1854 to 1915, the increase has been 14.1 per cent. These figures are based on wholesale prices, and it is a fair assumption that the retail-price increases will very closely approximate those of the wholesale-price increases. Bringing the price figures up to the latest date for which they are available, the month of September, 1916, by using figures relating to retail prices of food, the increase over 1854 is 32.4 per cent. In other words, the increase from the average for 1915, to September 15, 1916, in price of food commodities as a group is greater than the increase of the average price for the whole period from 1854 to 1915. The increase during the nine months ended September 15, 1916, over the average price for the year 1915 is approximately 16 per cent.

For the last few years the figures showing wage increases are based on the union wage scale. It is a well-known fact that in many industries to-day wages in excess of the union scale are being paid.

Interesting in connection with this study are some pertinent figures shown by the General Review of Crop Conditions on October 1, 1916, issued by the Bureau of Crop Estimates of the Department of Agriculture. From this report it appears that the index figure of prices paid to the producers of the United States for principal crops on October 1, 1916, is about 27.6 per cent higher than a year ago, 19.9 per cent higher than two years ago, and 23.8 per cent higher than the average of the last eight years on the same date. This report shows that the corn crop is estimated to be 11 per cent below the yield of last year; wheat, 40 per cent; oats, 20 per cent; barley, 22 per cent; rye, 15 per cent; white potatoes, 16 per cent; and apples, 14 per cent. The index figures of meat animals on September 15, 1916, show prices paid to producers of about 23.7 per cent higher than the figures of a year ago; 10.5 per cent higher than two years ago; and 2.5 per cent higher than the average of the last six years on the same date. All these facts point to a still higher charge for food supplies.

Rather startling are the figures compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics relative to wheat and flour for the period from May to September, 1916. The report on this subject shows that the average retail price of flour increased from \$7.62 per barrel in May, 1916, to \$9.39 per barrel in September, 1916, and press reports since that time indicate that the retail price of flour has gone to \$12 per barrel.

From the above statements it clearly appears that wages in all branches of industries have more than kept pace with the increased cost of living, but that no increase has been made in the wage scale of Government employees, notwithstanding the fact that since 1854 the daily task of all wage earners has been steadily decreasing, while the Government employee has received increased hours, with no consequent increase in compensation to offset, in a measure, the increased living cost.

That living costs in the last few years have gone up to an unprecedented extent is not shown by Government reports alone. The Annalist states that in the year ended September 30, 1916, the increase in a selected group of commodities, arranged to represent a theoretical family's food budget, has gone from 135 to 185, or an increase of about 37 per cent. The percentage of increase in food commodities shown by the Annalist compares with the official figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics compiled to June 30, 1916.

The Secretary assumes that the cost of living increased from 1854 to 1915, 14.1 per cent, and from 1915 until his latest estimate was made, which was September 15, 1916, the increase

was 16 per cent. In other words, according to the Secretary, the increase in the cost of living in the period covering a little more than a year, during these war times, was greater than the increase in cost of living from 1854 to 1915. I think the Secretary's figures on the increase in the cost of living are ultra-conservative. I believe they are entirely too low, but they demonstrate that the increase in wages which I suggest is anything but radical.

I want to call the attention of the House to another official report. The other day we increased the appropriation for the Children's Bureau, very properly so. One of the most interesting reports submitted by the Children's Bureau has to do with infant mortality in Johnstown, Pa., and Manchester, N. H., and deals particularly with the effect of high wages upon infant mortality. Of the babies with fathers earning less than \$450 a year, 1 in 4 died, while, in that same vicinity, where the fathers earned more than \$1,050 per year only 1 baby in 16 died.

I call attention to the fact that there are scores and hundreds of fathers in the Government service earning \$450 a year. We want to increase their wages, but we are also seeking to increase the wages of the fathers who earn \$1,050 a year.

This report goes on to point out that where the mother has to go out to work the increase in infant mortality is startling, and, of course, where the father fails to earn a living wage the mother must assist in making up the deficit. I might give the figures, if time permitted, but it is sufficient to know that when you deprive the father of a living wage you crush the life out of the baby. I want now to quote another great governmental authority upon the effect of increased wages upon the health and happiness of a people. I suppose the most famous authority on sanitation in the world is Surg. Gen. Gorgas, of the Army. In an address delivered before the fifteenth annual conference of health officers in New York City, and issued by the American Medical Association, Gen. Gorgas makes this statement concerning the results achieved at Panama:

The eradication of yellow fever and the control of certain other diseases at Habana and Panama was undoubtedly due to the special sanitary measures taken against these diseases. But these special features could have no effect on the general health conditions. For the last 15 years I have given a great deal of thought to this matter. What did we do to cause the great general improvement in health conditions which took place shortly after our arrival at both places, and which has since continued?

At Panama, shortly after our arrival, we increased the wages of the common laborer from 11 cents an hour to 20 cents an hour. This was nearly four times the wages of the laborer in the surrounding countries.

If we paid the citizen of a foreign country four times the wages he got at home, we naturally had to increase largely the pay of American citizens whom we wished to get to come to the Isthmus. This caused a steady increase in wages all along the line.

This large increase of wages caused a great general improvement in all living conditions—more room to live in, better food, and better clothing. I am satisfied that to this improvement in social conditions, caused by our high wages, we owe principally our extraordinary improvement in general health conditions.

It is a health officer's duty to urge forward these measures in his community which will control individual diseases; but my long experience has taught me that it is still more his duty to take that broader view of life which goes to the root of bad hygiene and do what he can to elevate the general social conditions of his community. This, my experience has taught me, can best be accomplished by increasing wages. Such measures tend at the same time to alleviate the poverty, misery, and suffering which are occurring among the poorest classes everywhere in modern communities.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. I want to call attention to the fact that \$1,800 is the lowest salary not affected by the gentleman's amendment, but in case the salary is \$1,700 a year the amendment would so affect it that the \$1,700 man would receive \$70 more than the \$1,800 man.

Mr. KEATING. The \$1,800 man receives an increase under this amendment.

Mr. LANGLEY. And there is no such salary as \$1,700.

Mr. KEATING. I presume not. The fact is that you may imagine a situation where some clerk now in a lower grade would be given a higher salary than a clerk now in a higher grade, but I do not believe it would work out in that way.

The practical effect would be that the poor fellow down below the \$1,200 limit would get a 20 per cent increase, and I do not think it is sufficient in many instances. I wish we could make a much greater advance in the salaries of those who might be referred to as the "submerged" portion of the Government employees—the poor devils referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], the men who are drawing \$40 and \$50 and \$55 per month; and the unfortunate charwomen, who scrub the floors of our public buildings for the munificent remuneration of \$240 a year.

Some gentleman asks why they retain these positions, why can not they quit, why can they not go and get another job? There is no particular reason why they can not quit, except the

fear that clutches the heart of men who know that if they give up one job they may not be able to secure another job. That is the reason they do not throw up these positions.

It is no answer to an argument for an increase in salary to say that you can get another man to take the place of the poor fellow who is receiving a salary that will not sustain life. So far as this Government is concerned, it should lay down the rule that every employee must have a living wage. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations embraced section 6 in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill proposing an increase of 10 per cent in salaries of all Government employees whose salaries are less than \$1,200 per year and an increase of 5 per cent of all salaries from \$1,200 to \$1,800 per annum. The proposed amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] proposes an increase of 20 per cent on all salaries below \$1,200 per annum and an increase of 10 per cent on all salaries between \$1,200 and \$1,800 per annum.

The Committee of the Whole House the other day increased the salaries of clerks to Members from \$1,500 to \$2,000 per year. This discussion has taken rather a wide latitude on the question of increases of salaries at this time. At this time, in addition to later registering my vote against it, I want to protest against the amendment increasing the salaries of clerks to Members from \$1,500 to \$2,000 per year. There is no doubt about the proposition that 95 per cent of the private secretaries of every one of us are now getting more money than they can get in private establishments to save their lives. If not, why are they here? Why are they willing to sacrifice their time and energy in working for us when they could get better and higher salaries by working for private institutions?

The Committee of the Whole House recently incorporated in this bill a provision voting an additional clerk at the rate of \$75 per month during the time Congress is in session. I am equally opposed to this. I do not believe Members can justify themselves in voting for either of these propositions. I do not believe they will do it when it comes to a yea-and-nay vote on these two propositions. This proposed increase in salaries of private secretaries from \$1,500 to \$2,000 per year, additional stenographers at the rate of \$75 per month while Congress is in session, together with the proposed increase of salaries of all clerks up to \$1,800 per year, appropriated for in this bill, and working in the city of Washington or elsewhere may well be characterized as a "salary grab" pure and simple. This is all it is, and it should be looked upon and treated as such by those who must finally pay the bill, as well as those who receive the proposed benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard many Members upon the floor of the House time and time again talk about the poor, unfortunate farmer, saying he is the man who bears the burden of taxation, and I quite agree with them on this proposition, and later I will demonstrate the truth of these statements and then see whether or not the friends of the farmer, when the roll is called upon all these increases in salaries, will vote as they have talked.

I have heard it stated on the floor of the House time and time again that the Government should be a "model employer." No one has undertaken to define what the phrase "model employer" means. Does it mean that the Government as an employer should pay higher wages than private employers? If this is what those mean who use the phrase, then they are answered, because the Government does pay its employees much higher wages than the private employer. This is answered by the facts in the case; beyond question our Government pays to its employees much higher salaries than any other Government upon the face of the earth pays to its employees. The salary of our Government employee ranges from 25 to 50 per cent per year higher than the salaries paid by any other Government to their employees. I make this statement after due and careful investigation from books and reports found on file in the library.

Without fear of successful contradiction, I undertake to say that the Government pays from 15 to 30 per cent higher wages to its employees than is paid private employees. Take the salary paid to our private secretaries—\$1,500 per year. Thousands upon thousands of traveling men now traveling for private employers do not get as much as \$1,500 per year. Thousands upon thousands of bright, active young attorneys, graduates of our leading law colleges, are now receiving less than \$1,500 per year. Thousands upon thousands of bright, active young men, graduates of medical schools, now receive less than this sum per annum. Yesterday, coming up on the car from the Treasury Department, I asked the conductor how much he was paid. He answered me, "From 23 to 27 cents per hour,

working 10 hours per day." The conductor and the motorman must work in the open, exposed to all kinds of inclement weather, and work day and night, without a single day's lay-off in the whole 365 days in each year.

All the clerks and employees working for the Government in the city of Washington have 30 days' leave of absence with full pay each year. In addition, they have 30 days' sick leave of absence with full pay. They have a full Saturday afternoon off during the months of June, July, August, and part of September. They have seven full holidays with pay. All told, the employees working for the Government in the city of Washington work approximately 257 days out of the 313 working days of the year. These same employees here in the city of Washington are now moving heaven and earth, bringing all pressure they can upon the President to get him by an Executive order to establish the half holiday all the year round with full pay. Not so with the private employee working in the city of Washington. He does not get 30 days' leave with full pay or 30 days' sick leave with full pay or his half holiday. He must put in 313 days per year, less the seven national holidays.

I want to briefly quote from a farmers' bulletin which I have, for the benefit of my farmer friends of the House whom I have heard talking so long and so loud and so pitifully, bewailing the unfortunate condition of those living in the country.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I can not yield. I would if I had time. I would be glad to do so. It is Farmers' Bulletin 746. On page 6 of the bulletin, under the title "Earnings of different classes of workers," "annual average for farmers, cash, farm supplies, \$600." This means the income earned by the farmer and his family. The family averages five persons. This would mean an average income for each member of the farmers' family of \$120 per year, an exceedingly small amount. Mark you, that out of this \$600 earned by the farmer and his family he must buy his supplies, keep his family, pay his taxes, insurance, doctor bills, and all the usual expense connected with the keeping of a family. The farmer knows no holidays except Sunday. He and his family work each day in the year at something. He does not observe the eight-hour day, but works from daylight until dark. He has no 30 days' leave of absence with pay, no 30 days' sick leave of absence with pay. He has no Saturday afternoons off for three months in the year. He is the man who with his family is compelled to work in the open, in the rain, sleet, snow, and sunshine under any and all conditions favorable or unfavorable.

The Government employees in the city of Washington, including our private secretaries, at least 90 per cent of them work in the most favorable conditions seven hours per day in splendidly equipped Government buildings, well lighted, heated, ventilated, with sanitary conditions as nearly perfect as possible. I trust my farmer friends will remember these conditions when they come to vote upon the proposed increase of salaries, when they come to vote upon this salary-grab measure.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GORDON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HOPWOOD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will that interfere with those of us who desire to be heard upon this question if this five minutes be granted?

Mr. COX. Not on the other side.

Mr. HOPWOOD. I am on the other side, and therefore will not object.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no objections, the gentleman can proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Again quoting from the farmers' bulletin:

Wage earners on street railways, \$674 per year; in iron and steel works, \$610 per year; in factories, \$460 per year; in telephone companies, \$438 per year.

SALARIED EMPLOYEES.

In factories, \$1,188; on street railways, \$1,122; patrolmen, \$1,052; Federal employees, \$948; in telephone companies, \$843; clergymen, \$663.

As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] so well and forcibly stated a moment ago, there are not less than 4,000,000 wage earners in the country to-day drawing the small salary of \$470 per year. There are upward of five and one-half million wage earners and toilers who earn less than \$600 per year. Enough? No! I wish it were possible for private employers to increase all the salaries of their employees, but I presume that a majority of the employers of labor in this country are paying to their employees all they can afford to pay. The news-

papers of the city of Washington, day in and day out since Congress convened, have waged an unrelenting fight for the increase of salaries of Government employees. I undertake to say that many of the employees of the newspapers here in the city of Washington are getting far less than the lowest paid employee working for the Government. In my opinion it would be quite interesting reading, as well as instructive and entertaining, if these newspapers would publish the names of all of their employees and the salaries paid each. Why do not they do it? The merchants, bankers, hotel people, restaurant men, and all others in the city have enlisted in this fight to increase the salaries of clerks in the Government, and yet it is conceded that employees here in Washington are getting from 20 to 50 per cent higher salaries than these same people are paying to their employees in private life.

Since returning to Washington I had occasion to go up on an elevator in one of the largest hotels in the city. I asked the elevator man what wages he was drawing and how many hours he was required to work. He replied, "Thirty-five dollars per month, with hours ranging from 8 to 10 and 12." I recently went up on an elevator in one of the large department stores here in the city and asked the elevator man the same question. He answered me "he was getting \$30 per month, and working from 8 to 12 hours per day," while the Government pays its elevator men \$720 per year for 8 hours' labor, and if the subject could be properly investigated this would be substantially true in all the various occupations of labor here in the District; but it is to the financial interests of the newspapers, the merchants, bankers, hotel and restaurant men, and others living in the city to get the salaries of these clerks increased, because it means more money to them, more money will be expended in the city. Yet they do not pay one cent of the additional taxes imposed upon the people because of these proposed increased salaries, not a penny. Every cent of this additional increase will be paid by the people of the United States. Their interest in seeking to have the salaries increased is not a human interest but a selfish interest. Their agitation for an increase of salary is designed solely to benefit themselves without regard to the burden it will impose upon those who pay the taxes.

Mr. TEMPLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COX. I can not yield.

Mr. TEMPLE. I would just like to know the date of that bulletin?

Mr. COX. It is dated July 6, 1916. Those who care to carefully investigate the subject of salaries paid by our Government as compared to the salaries paid by other governments will find that we are paying approximately 50 per cent higher salaries to our employees than any other government pays. Those who care to investigate and who will take time to investigate the salaries paid by the Government to its employees with the salaries paid by private establishments to their employees in the same identical line of work will find that the Government is paying its employees upon an average from 15 to 30 per cent higher wages than private employers pay.

Briefly, I want to call the attention of the House to a bulletin issued by the Bureau of Education, No. 31, issued in 1915. On page 18 of the bulletin will be found a compilation of salaries paid by both private and public institutions, as follows:

RURAL TEACHERS, FARM LABORERS, AND RURAL MAIL CARRIERS.

The average annual wage of farm laborers in 1913 was \$257. The average for rural school-teachers appears to range only slightly higher—exact figures are not obtainable. It is interesting to compare with these two classes of workers the rural mail carriers, who receive an average salary of \$1,115. In Alabama the figure for male farm laborers was \$173 in 1913, while rural mail carriers received \$1,052; the average salary for all teachers in the State for 1914—including teachers in the large cities—was \$446 for male and \$369 for female, while for rural teachers in two counties selected at random it was \$310. In Arkansas the counties selected reported \$273 as the average annual salary of teachers, male farm laborers average \$204, and mail carriers on rural routes \$1,043. California, one of the best-paying States for teachers, shows \$804 for teachers in two counties, as compared with \$421 for farm laborers and \$1,046 for rural carriers. Colorado pays \$309 to farm laborers, \$1,060 to rural mail carriers, and \$306 to teachers in independent districts. The rural counties in Connecticut pay an average of \$449—not quite half the pay of the mail men. Iowa pays her rural teachers in at least two counties less than farm laborers—\$326 as compared with \$368; rural mail carriers in this State average \$1,081. Massachusetts averages \$455 to rural teachers for four counties; male farm laborers receive \$306, and rural mail carriers \$1,031. North Carolina (26 counties) paid her rural teachers an average of \$160, as compared with \$191 for farm labor, and \$1,034 for rural mail carriers. In Oregon, on the other hand, teachers are paid an average of \$605 (two counties), as compared with \$372 for male farm labor and \$1,056 for rural mail carriers. In Pennsylvania the average teacher's salary for the entire State is \$744 for males and \$550 for females, as compared with \$1,057 for rural mail carriers. In Tennessee (46 counties) the average salary for rural teachers was \$223, as compared with \$190 for male farm laborers, and \$1,051 for rural mail carriers.

Mr. Chairman, this bulletin is very interesting, especially when considered in the light of the argument made by the

advocates for increased salaries to Government clerks. It establishes the fact beyond peradventure that Government clerks and Government employees are paid out of all proportion above private employees or other kinds of public employment. This bulletin asserts that the average annual wage of farm laborers in 1913 was \$237 in the United States, and that the average for rural-school teachers appears to range only slightly higher.

In Alabama the average price paid to farm laborers was \$173 in 1913. The average salary for all school-teachers in the State of Alabama for 1914 was \$446 for male teachers and \$369 for female teachers, while the average price paid to rural-route carriers was \$1,052.

In Arkansas the average wage paid farm laborers was \$204, and the average wage paid to school-teachers in counties reporting was \$273, while the average salary paid to rural carriers was \$1,043.

Take North Carolina. In 26 counties the average paid to her rural-school teachers was \$160 and the average paid her farm laborers was \$191, while the average paid the rural-route carriers was \$1,034. Take the great State of Massachusetts, noted for its progress and intellectual activities as well as humane-ness. The average paid to rural-school teachers was \$455 and to farm laborers \$306, and the average paid to rural-route carriers was \$1,031. These figures are very significant, if not startling. These figures meet and refute the argument of those who contend that Government employees are underpaid as compared to private employees. It requires a great deal more study, more knowledge, more information on the part of school-teachers to equip themselves for their profession and to enable them to secure a license to teach school than is required of the average civil-service employee before they can successfully stand a civil-service examination. I adhere to the doctrine and commend the argument that the Government should be a model employer. I insist it is a model employer in each one and all of its departments. It pays its employees higher than any other employer; its employees work shorter hours than 90 per cent of other employees. Its employees are better housed, work in better sanitary conditions than private employees. Its employees have more holidays with full pay than any other class of employees in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a pleasant task for me to assume; but if I interpret my duty aright as a Representative of the people, I must stand on the one hand between those who are to receive, and on the other between those who must pay the bills. I must stand between those who are to receive the benefits on the one hand and those who must have their taxes increased in order to pay these benefits on the other.

I must be just before I am generous. I can not be just to those who pay the tax, and at the same time vote millions out of the Treasury, every dollar of which must be raised by taxation in some form. I may be wrong in my sense of duty; I may not see things from the proper viewpoint, but my sense of duty and my viewpoint compels me to take a stand with the already overburdened taxpayers of the Nation who are crying out on every hand against the onerous increased burden of taxes.

Many thousands of bills are introduced every session of Congress to take money out of the Treasury which mean taxes, and a very small number of bills are introduced proposing to put money in the Treasury. Mr. Chairman, if all these proposed increases in salary to Government clerks and employees and private secretaries go through, and become law, and the same provision proposing similar increases of Government salaries are placed on other appropriation bills, it will mean a charge upon the Treasury of not less than \$25,000,000 for the ensuing fiscal year. The price is too high for me to pay. I refuse to vote it.

I am willing to pay the debt, and take the consequences whatever may befall me politically or otherwise. The Secretary of the Treasury informs Congress that in 1918 there will be no escaping a Treasury deficit of \$300,000,000. This means that we have got to issue Government bonds or cast about and find some other thing or piece of property on which to place a tax. Instead of constantly increasing the burdens of taxation the wise thing to do, the just thing to do, the economic thing to do is for Congress to cease making so many useless appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I concede that the cost of living is high, but we should remember that the high cost of living is hitting the wage earners, the toilers, the farmers; in fact, everybody just as hard and just as severe as it is hitting Government employees, and it is unfair to impose a tax upon those underpaid private and public establishments in order to increase the salaries of Government employees upon any ground, legally or morally. It will not be defended by the taxpayers when they come to vote in the next election. They will hold Members of Congress responsible for it, as they ought to.

This proposed increase of salary to Government employees and the proposed increase of salary of our private secretaries should meet a stern defeat when the roll is called upon these measures. I shall vote against it and abide the judgment of the people who have commissioned me to represent them in Congress. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SHERLEY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 324. Joint resolution authorizing payment of the salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1916.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill H. R. 8092, entitled "An act confirming patents heretofore issued to certain Indians in the State of Washington," disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PIRMAN, Mr. LANE, and Mr. CLAPP as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HOPWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment offered increasing the wages 10 and 20 per cent instead of 5 and 10 per cent, and my reason is briefly this: That in every other department of industry in our country the wages have already been increased more than that. In the coke regions in Pennsylvania wages have been increased. I cut a clipping yesterday out of a local paper to this effect, namely, that there had been a 10 per cent increase for 40,000 men in the coke region. This 10 per cent comes upon two other increases during the past year—one last February of 10 per cent, one later on, I think in July, of 5 per cent, and now another of 10 per cent, making 25, or, rather, by taking the percentages on the preceding percentages, making 27 per cent of increase during the year.

Now, one of the gentlemen who was arguing against this matter said that "we must take into consideration the men back home." The men back home are making more money than they ever made before, because of the peculiar conditions at this time, and they have been making that sort of money for the past two years, while the man on salary, either in the Government employ of any other employ, unless his salary has been raised, is the worst-fixed man in this country to-day. The prosperity instead of benefiting him is detrimental. Without any increase in salary, he is compelled to pay from 60 to 100 per cent more for living expenses.

I cut another clipping from the same paper, which is headed "\$108.89 two weeks' pay."

It says:

Talking of fat pay envelopes—

Says a news item from Connellsville on Monday—

coal miners are particularly favored these days. Semimonthly pays of \$80, \$90, to \$100 are not uncommon. Some are faring even better. At Davidson plant of the H. C. Frick Coke Co. August Fink last week drew \$108.89 for his two weeks' work. To do this he loaded one hundred and twenty-one 40-bushel wagons, mined all his own coal by use of a pick, and set his own timbers. At Coalbrook William Richey mined and loaded 137 wagons of 37 bushels each, his pay amounting to \$102.13. At neither plant are machines used for mining. Recently two workers at Trotter made big records for a day's work, but this was for loading only, the mining being done by machine.

So, when you talk about taking care of people back home, they are being taken care of a great deal better than we are taking care of the Government employees. The great corporations of the country, when prosperity comes to them and when prices are advanced for their product, always automatically raise the wages of their employees. But the Government seems to have adopted a flat rate of pay, paying men so much per month or per year, and they pay it year after year, good times and bad, high prices or low, whether living costs 100 per cent more now than it did when the wages were fixed. It pays them the same wage now as it did 40 or 50 years ago when the present scale was adopted. It is a ridiculous and an outrageous thing to do.

They talk about the farmer getting \$600 a year only. He is getting nearly \$2 a bushel for his wheat. He is getting 60 or 80 per cent more than he ever was getting before—more than when that 1909 schedule was made up that was referred to by one of the opponents of this advance. In riding over my county one day recently I was with a man who had 700 bushels of potatoes to sell, and he said, "What do you think I was offered for my potatoes?" I said, "I do not know." He said, "One

dollar and seventy-five cents at my barn." That is about 75 cents more than he ever was paid for them before.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPWOOD. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. In what part of the wheat-raising section of this country are the farmers getting anything near \$2 a bushel for wheat?

Mr. HOPWOOD. I do not know what they are getting. I know the market prices. There is no doubt he is getting well up to that, because the farmer is smart enough these days to get all that is coming to him.

Mr. SLOAN. On what market is wheat \$2 a bushel now?

Mr. HOPWOOD. It was close to \$2.

Mr. SLOAN. It was; but in the market at Chicago it is only \$1.60 after you carry it to Chicago.

Mr. HOPWOOD. Do not you people in the West get pretty near that at your own market?

Mr. SLOAN. Oh, no; there are some freight rates.

Mr. HOPWOOD. I think it is selling in Pennsylvania at the mills at about the market quotation. They may have better markets than you have in the West.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HOPWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I heartily agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] "that no increase should be made that can not be justified by the general increase in wages throughout the country." I have indicated the increase of about 27 per cent in my own district in the pay of the employees of the coal and coke companies. This increase has also been made in the wages of the employees of the iron and steel works of our country.

The farm laborer and the common laborer in the towns and cities of our land have also received increased wages in many instances of at least 50 per cent within the past two years. I venture to say that the general increase throughout the country in all lines of industry will average more than 20 per cent in the past two years. I also venture the assertion that the increase in cost of keeping a family within the last two years is much more than 20 per cent.

The advance, therefore, as contemplated by the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] is justifiable and right, not only from the standpoint of the general increase in wages throughout the country but also from the high cost of living that causes every man with a family many anxious hours to solve the problems that confront him as to how he is to give to those he loves the common necessities and comforts of life.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, at this time, when there is a perfect deluge of bills for increasing salaries, it appears to me there ought to be some consideration given to the state of the Treasury. No one of these gentlemen, so far as I know, who have offered these various bills for increases, has even attempted to tell the House how much they would cost if carried through all the various departments or even through the particular departments that are now under consideration. Nor have they ventured to think, apparently, about the ways and means for raising the necessary funds to pay these bureau expenses. How many gentlemen in the House have considered that for this fiscal year there will be a deficit of \$103,000,000 according to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury?

That is based on the supposition that the National Guard will be withdrawn from the Mexican border on the 1st of January, and no one expects that such action will be taken. We have to-day in the Treasury only about \$45,000,000 if we exclude the amount placed to the credit of the disbursing officers, which is no part of the free balance in the Treasury. This balance in the Treasury is melting away at a rate exceeding \$20,000,000 a month.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow an interruption right there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. If you exclude the subsidiary coin and the bullion that is provided for coinage, you would have only about \$30,000,000 in the Treasury to-day?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes. They aggregate something between \$10,000,000 and \$15,000,000, and that would leave nearly that amount. Of course, the great bulk of the income and corporation taxes will not be paid until June of next year, and at that time there will be a balance.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. FOCHT. Will the gentleman explain why that money is not there? And if it is not there, how it can be put there, so that we can pay this increase of salaries? Both can be done. You know why it is not there, and you know that it can be provided for. We all know that it can be provided for.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, the gentleman can tell that in his own time. I am talking about the condition of the Treasury. Before the income tax and the corporation tax come in we will either have to issue bonds or run the Treasury on trust funds, one or the other. We must use money that we ought not to use or issue bonds.

Gentlemen who have stated the condition of the Treasury on the Democratic side have been altogether too conservative in their statements. The deficit will be nearer \$150,000,000 if we continue the same military expense for the remainder of the fiscal year, and the report of the Secretary of the Treasury shows that if we do not increase taxation for the next fiscal year—the year ending June 30, 1918—the expenditures will exceed the receipts more than \$300,000,000. That is in addition to the fact that we will be more than \$100,000,000 behind in our balance at the beginning of the fiscal year 1918.

The gentleman who just asked me to yield seems to think it is easy to raise these vast sums that are necessary to put our Treasury in a good condition, in a condition where it would not be obliged to use trust funds or where the Government would not be obliged to issue bonds. Perhaps some gentlemen can tell us just how it can be done. I do not know at this time how it can be raised, and I doubt whether any other gentleman does. We can not go into the business of lifting ourselves over the fence by our boot straps by taxing men who have incomes amounting to only \$1,500 a year in order to pay somebody in the Government employ an additional sum. We could probably raise \$100,000,000 on the tariff. We could put perhaps 50 cents more on the tax on beer and 15 cents more on the tax on distilled liquors, and together we could get \$50,000,000 from those two sources. But still we would not have enough, and other methods must be used besides taxes on luxuries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING], not because I do not personally feel that I would like to increase the salaries of all wage earners, but in a spirit of justice both to the wage earners who are not employed by the Federal Government and those who happen to be employed by the Federal Government. We must look at this from one standpoint, and that is the particular point that I want to press in upon you in the brief time that is allotted to me.

Whatever raise we adopt in this bill we must in all fairness make uniform throughout the Government service. We can not defend a raise for the clerks in the executive departments in Washington that we could not defend for the civil-service employees in other great centers of the country or employees of the Government here in the Capitol. There is no peculiar condition applying to these men in the executive departments that does not apply all over the country, and it was for that reason that I offered the amendment a short time ago, extending this raise recommended by the committee to all of the employees included in this bill. We must have a raise, if we have one, which is not only uniform but which we are in a position to defend.

I have received petitions from post-office clerks in my district, where I think there are in the neighborhood of 1,000 or 1,200 post-office employees, asking for raises in their salaries. I know that the maximum salary in the post offices among clerks and carriers is \$1,200 a year. For railway mail clerks it goes up to \$1,600. But the maximum salary for post-office employees is \$1,200. I know that the conditions affecting their employment are precisely the conditions affecting employment here, with the exception that they work longer hours and more days in a year. There are 478,000 civil-service employees in the United States. This bill appropriates for about 8 per cent of that whole number. But whatever principle we adopt in this bill, we ought in fairness to carry it out to the other civil-service employees, and I for one am not willing to vote for the increase of any special class of Government employees that I would not be willing to extend to another class of Government employees similarly situated.

That is the whole situation here. To extend the raise recommended by the Appropriations Committee to the Government employees situated as these are would cost from \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000. To extend it as proposed by the gentleman from Colorado would cost approximately \$130,000,000. I do not personally think that there is a justification for a 20 per cent increase of wages. I heard these arguments made here

when my amendment was under consideration, that there are thousands of men trying to crowd into the Government service. I have no doubt it is true. Even in these prosperous times, when labor is at a premium, there are still thousands of men trying to crowd into the Government service, indicating that the Government service is not a hardship and is not underpaid and is not undesirable.

Therefore if we make an increase for these men we ought not to give a cent more than the committee has recommended—a 10 per cent increase under \$1,200 and a 5 per cent increase between \$1,200 and \$1,800. And then we must make up our minds that that same rate of increase ought to be carried out to the men who do not happen to be employed in the city of Washington in the same spirit of justice that we would give it to the men who happen to be employed here. Unless we can defend a raise for all of the civil-service employees, 478,000 of them, we can not defend a raise for any of them; for I will undertake to say that the conditions of living in the city of Washington are not as high in many respects as they are in some of the western and coast cities of the United States. And I will undertake to say that the conditions of employment here are better in many respects than they are in many cities throughout the Union. I will undertake to say that there are a large number of employees here in the District of Columbia who are engaged in outside business, running printing offices, stores, truck gardens, delivery wagons, automobile liverys, and all sorts of things all over the District of Columbia, because of the short hours and the small number of days in the year that they are compelled to work for the Government. But the civil-service employee in the great Postal Service of the United States has no such opportunity. We must have a raise which will apply equally to all men similarly situated.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this economy preached by some of the gentlemen on the other side of the House when it comes to paying men wages that they may live on is very far-fetched when we go back to the preceding session of this present Congress and remember the tremendous expenditures that they voted for at all times without any excuse. Among them there was one useless item of expenditure that would have been sufficient to pay the employees of the United States the increased wages that they ought to have ten times over. That was the armor-plate factory, a thing passed without any excuse except that the poor figurers, the committeemen on the other side of the House, said that they did not know what the price of armor plate was, therefore they ought to build a factory and find out, at an expense of \$11,000,000 to the people of the United States. And that is not half what the expense will be when the building is put up and the works is going, and by that time we will in all probability not need any armor plate, as it will be obsolete.

Those things are brought in and put forward as a wonderful expense account, and they say, "Oh, we can not afford this added expense to pay wages to employees. Why, the exchequer now is short. We have not got enough money to buy these armor-plate factories. Therefore the individual who works for the Government and keeps it running must starve." That is about the conclusion you come to. I am for this advance in wages all along the line to these employees.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARLAND. No; I will not yield. I have only five minutes. I am for this advance all along the line, because it is satisfactory to those to whom it applies, and I think that is a very good reason. That reason was sufficient here a short time ago, when we were voting on something which the President of the United States insisted upon in the House—the Adamson bill. The people back of it were satisfied, and that was the only real reason and excuse offered, and in this case it is identically the same.

Some one here compared the rates of wages paid in Washington on the street cars. Then the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] brought in a pamphlet showing wages 5, 6, 8, and 10 years ago. He quoted those old wage scales to show you what wages are now. My friends, there has been a mighty change within the last year. The big corporations of this country, those that hire the most men, have raised wages three times, 10 per cent each time, an advance of 32 per cent. Yet you are coming in here and hesitating about giving these poor fellows this increase. I will say to you clearly that I do not think this is enough for them. I think the increase should have been 20 per cent and 15 per cent, and then 10 per cent above \$1,800.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GARLAND. No; I will not yield.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not blame him.

Mr. GARLAND. I have got only a couple of minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GARLAND. The wages paid on the street cars here are said to be about \$2.20 a day. That is not what we pay out in our country, and if that is the wage here it only goes to show that the people of Washington do not get what they ought to get, because the employees of the Government are the mark that is held up, and they say, "These Government clerks do not get any more, therefore you can not." In all our conferences in years gone by with employers the wages of Government employees were always used to beat down our wages.

Then, I want to say that the men on the street cars do not have to take an examination. In the Government service even the fellow who labors has got to go through an examination before he can get on. All of these men in Government service who work for these low wages have had to pass an examination of some form or other, and some of them are mighty hard ones. And I want to say that this present administration has a way of escaping even the payment of those wages that are now paid or should be paid. They have used this method before. When they find that they are a little short in their appropriations they simply lay off employees and require that they come to work every half day or every other day during the layoff and catch up with the work that they missed the day before. That was done two years ago, and I have introduced a bill to pay \$50,000 to remunerate the men who work in the Federal building, the scrub women, the janitors, and those who get the lowest wages. I have a bill in here to remunerate them for eight days which they lost. When at the end of the year it was found that the appropriation was a little short they laid off those poor fellows, made them come to work every half day or every other day, and compelled them to work harder and to do in one day the work that they should have done in two. I say that is an injustice of which the Government of the United States ought to be ashamed. [Applause.]

I hope this amendment will prevail.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, whatever action is taken on this bill relative to the increase of compensation of the Federal employees in the District of Columbia should be taken with respect to employees throughout the United States. It was the purpose of the Committee on Appropriations in making its report to attempt to establish a rule that could be applied uniformly to the employees of the Federal Government throughout the United States.

There are many differences of opinion as to what would be a proper ratio of increase. The great bulk of the commercial establishments which have given increased compensation to their employees have increased them 10 per cent. That seems to be the uniform rule adopted. There are employees of the Federal Government at salaries ranging from \$1,200 to \$1,800 whose compensation amounts to \$176,751,000, and employees at salaries of less than \$1,200 whose compensation aggregates \$155,187,381, making a total of \$337,311,866.

An increase of 10 per cent upon the compensation of those receiving salaries up to \$1,200, and 5 per cent on those receiving compensation of \$1,200 to \$1,800 will require an appropriation of \$23,720,673 for the fiscal year of 1918.

If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] be adopted, the sum required will be \$51,441,346. So that the question that we are called upon to decide at this particular time is whether by this proposed amendment we will increase the amount to be paid in compensation to employees of the Government \$51,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who have worked to bring about, if it be possible to do so, some reasonable action by Congress to afford some additional compensation to Government employees who, as pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois, are employed at fixed salaries and do not share in the present great prosperity of the country. They are to some extent penalized because of excessive prices which prevail at present, and I believe it would be just and proper to do what is possible to help them.

There are many differences of opinion as to what should be done, but when it was considered, despite all assertions to the contrary, that the average Government employee is better off in the Government service than he would be outside of the service, that the average increase at this time because of existing conditions by private employers is 10 per cent, that we are facing a deficit of \$284,000,000, not including the possible additional expenditure of \$25,000,000 under the terms of the treaty for the acquisition of the Danish West Indies, which easily, as I pointed out the other day, makes possible a deficit running far in excess of \$300,000,000, notwithstanding all these matters it seems to the committee that the just, the fair, and the reasonable thing to do, and what can be justified in the face of all the facts, was to make the proposed increase of 10 and 5 per cent in the compensation as proposed originally in the bill.

I should like to increase as much as possible the compensation of all persons who are compelled to work to earn their living. But there are some things to be considered other than the mere fact that we would be glad to please some one. The responsibility that rests upon us is not only to do justice to the employees and the Government, but to see that no injustice is done to those who must pay to support the Government. It seems to me that we should not go farther than was originally suggested. Whatever is done on this bill, if we are to be just, should be incorporated in the District bill, in the sundry civil bill, in the fortifications bill, in the Navy bill, the Army bill, the Agricultural bill, and in the bill for the support of the Diplomatic and Consular Service. We must include all the persons embraced within that total expenditure of \$357,000,000. It would be unjust to do anything else. To attempt at this time, under all the circumstances, to add not \$25,000,000 but \$51,000,000 to the proposed expenditures in the next year would be unpardonable from any standpoint. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado will not be agreed to, and that the committee will adopt the recommendation that was incorporated in this bill by the Committee on Appropriations, and establish it as a uniform rule to control the House in all of its proceedings in their action on the other appropriation bills. If we do that much we shall do justice to the employees and all that anyone can reasonably expect, and we shall be able to justify our action to the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have the amendment again reported to the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KEATING: Page 142, after the word "or," in line 18, strike out "ten" and insert "twenty," and in line 20 strike out the word "five" and insert "ten."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were 25 ayes and 144 noes.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. NOLAN: On page 143, line 4, after the colon following the word "herein," insert the following:

"Provided, That during the fiscal year 1918 the minimum compensation for any person provided for in this bill shall be not less than \$3 per day, or, if employed by the hour, not less than 37½ cents an hour, and if employed by the month, \$90 a month; or, if employed by the year, \$1,080 per annum: *Provided further*, That persons employed on an annual basis and who regularly perform less than a full day's service shall receive compensation at the rate of 37½ cents per hour: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to persons enlisted in the military branches of the Government or to persons receiving subsistence and quarters in addition to their compensation: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall apply only to those persons who have been continuously in the employment of the Government of the United States or in the employment of the government of the District of Columbia for a period of not less than two years and who shall have attained the age of 20 years.

Mr. SISSON. To that I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment that I offer is strictly in order. The rule provides:

That no amendment shall be in order in the consideration of the foregoing amendment changing existing law beyond the fiscal year 1918, nor shall any amendment be in order relating to the compensation of employees not appropriated for in H. R. 18542.

The amendment that I propose limits the provisions of the minimum salary to the pending bill and to the employees appropriated for in the pending bill; and inasmuch as the rule provides that no amendment shall be in order in the consideration of the amendment changing existing law I contend that my amendment is strictly in order, and that the point of order should not be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The special rule adopted only gave the committee the right to consider the Byrns amendment, which necessarily carried with it the right to offer germane amendments thereto. The rule did not authorize the adding of new affirmative legislation.

In the opinion of the Chair, the Byrns amendment simply proposed a lump appropriation to increase the compensation of employees of the Government provided for in this bill of a certain class, namely, those receiving less than \$1,800 per annum. The Nolan amendment proposes new affirmative legislation, namely, to adopt a policy by the Government that none of its employees appropriated for by this bill shall receive less than \$3 per day. The Chair can not see how the new affirmative legislation is germane to the intent or spirit of the Byrns amendment. Therefore the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the Chair amplify in the Record his reason for the ruling he has just announced?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the Chair will amplify his reason in the Record. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: Page 142, line 21, after the word "than," strike out "\$1,800" and insert "\$2,500."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Illinois on the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the rule, it seems to me, makes this amendment in order. Certainly this is in order, if the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] was in order, for an increase in salaries of Government employees. I can not see any ground whatever for the point of order. I have nothing further to say.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is clearly subject to the point of order. The amendment offered and now pending provides for increases of salaries to clerks of a certain class and not exceeding \$1,800 per year. The gentleman from Illinois seeks to raise the limit and provide that it shall apply to clerks who draw as much as \$2,500 a year. Clearly by implication the rule reported by the Committee on Rules intended that no amendment should be in order for those particular clerks of the class set forth in the amendment reported by the Committee on Rules. It seems to me it would be a strained construction and would go beyond the real meaning and intentions of the rule to hold that an amendment would be in order seeking to raise the limit from \$1,800 to \$2,500. I do not think it is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that this is an extremely close question, as members of the committee know, but, in the opinion of the Chair, this paragraph was to provide for an increase of compensation for the employees of a certain class, namely those within \$1,800 a year. The amendment proposed would create another class, and the Chair is of opinion that the amendment is not germane. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the other day in the discussion of items relative to the Subtreasuries I made a statement to the effect that I had been informed that the Clearing House Association in Boston had been discontinued on account of the fact that there is a Federal reserve bank located in that city. I made that statement based on information which was given to the committee in some hearings that had been conducted on the day before and had every reason to believe it was correct. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has handed me a telegram from his colleague [Mr. TAGUE] which I desire to read at this point, because I do not want to make any statement which is not entirely accurate. The telegram is as follows:

Hon. A. P. GARDNER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

BYRNS in debate stated clearing house, Boston, discontinued. I have seen President Gaston, of Boston Clearing House, who denies this. Boston Clearing House still doing business, as they always have done. Boston reserve bank has become member of clearing house. I am in Boston for election day.

PETER F. TAGUE, Congressman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, pending the rising of the committee, I ask unanimous consent that I may have a few minutes in which to make a statement in connection with the statement just made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] respecting the Boston Subtreasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has decided to rise, and the Chair thinks that such a request would be out of order.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the

bill H. R. 18542, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, pending that I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for half a minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to address the House for half a minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, all I wish to say is a word in respect to the telegram which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] just read from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE]. Mr. TAGUE requested me, on behalf of himself and on behalf of his colleagues, Mr. GALLIVAN and Mr. TINKHAM, to ask for a separate vote on the matter of the Boston Subtreasury. All of them are necessarily absent in Boston to-day on account of an election.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the two amendments relating to clerk hire of Members and Delegates. I think they are amendments numbered 1 and 2.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the two amendments relating to the Children's Bureau.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks for a separate vote on the two amendments about the increase of pay to clerks to Members, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks for a separate vote on two amendments relating to the Children's Bureau.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment by which the office of the assistant treasurer at Boston was done away with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] asks for a separate vote on the Boston Subtreasury.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment pertaining to the Subtreasury at Baltimore, and also a separate vote on the amendment pertaining to the Subtreasury at Chicago.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] asks for a separate vote on the Subtreasuries at Baltimore and Chicago.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment in the bill that provides for a session stenographer.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have already asked that.

Mr. BLACK. Excuse me.

The SPEAKER. That is included in the request of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. RAINEY. I ask for a separate vote on the Borland amendment—Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER. Are there any more? If not, the rest of the amendments will be voted on in gross.

The question was taken, and the remaining amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WHEELER, page 19—

Mr. CALDWELL rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. CALDWELL. The first amendment was my amendment in reference to a session stenographer.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It does not come that way.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CALDWELL: Page 19, line 18, after the word "for," insert "one"; before the word "hire," in line 19, insert "and one who shall be a stenographer"; in line 20, after the word "duties," insert "for one clerk"; and in line 22, after the word "necessary," insert "for the stenographer, \$75 per month during sessions of Congress, to pay which so much as may be necessary is hereby appropriated."

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York was a little late, but still the Chair will entertain his request demanding the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENNET. Is this the amendment providing for an additional session stenographer?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 105, nays 245, answered "present" 3, not voting 80, as follows:

YEAS—105.

Abercrombie	Fairchild	Lazaro	Rouse
Austin	Farley	Lehlbach	Rowe
Bacharach	Ferris	Lenroot	Schall
Barchfeld	Fields	Littlepage	Sears
Bennet	Focht	McArthur	Shouse
Bowers	Freeman	McDermott	Siegel
Buchanan, Ill.	Gardner	McKellar	Sinnott
Buchanan, Tex.	Garland	McKinley	Smith, Idaho
Caldwell	Glynn	Maher	Smith, N. Y.
Cantrill	Gould	Martin	Snell
Carter, Mass.	Graham	Miller, Pa.	Snyder
Carter, Okla.	Gray, N. J.	Mondell	Solloway
Chandler, N. Y.	Greene, Vt.	Moore, Pa.	Sutherland
Charles	Hamilton, N. Y.	Moore, Ind.	Swift
Church	Haskell	Mott	Taggart
Clark, Fla.	Hastings	Nicholls, S. C.	Tilson
Costello	Hayden	Oakey	Timberlake
Crago	Heaton	Olney	Walker
Curry	Hernandez	Parker, N. Y.	Ward
Dale, N. Y.	Hicks	Phelan	Wason
Dale, Vt.	Humphrey, Wash.	Platt	Whaley
Dallinger	Humphreys, Miss.	Powers	Wheeler
Dempsey	Husted	Ragsdale	Winslow
Dunn	Kearns	Raker	Woodyard
Dupré	Kless, Pa.	Ramseyer	
Estopinal	King	Roberts, Nev.	
Evans	Langley	Rodenberg	

NAYS—245.

Adair	Edwards	Kennedy, Iowa	Russell, Mo.
Adamson	Ellsworth	Kettner	Scott, Mich.
Alexander	Elston	Key, Ohio	Sells
Allen	Emerson	Kincheloe	Shallenberger
Almon	Esch	Kinkaid	Sherley
Anthony	Farr	Kitchin	Sherwood
Ashbrook	Fitzgerald	La Follette	Sims
Aswell	Fordney	Lee	Sisson
Ayres	Foss	Leshner	Slayden
Bailey	Foster	Lever	Sloan
Barkley	Frear	Lewis	Small
Barnhart	Fuller	Linthicum	Smith, Mich.
Bell	Gallagher	Lloyd	Smith, Minn.
Benedict	Gandy	London	Smith, Tex.
Black	Gard	Longworth	Sparkman
Blackmon	Garner	Loud	Stafford
Booher	Garrett	McAndrews	Steagall
Borland	Glass	McClintic	Stedman
Browne	Godwin, N. C.	McFadden	Steele, Iowa
Browning	Good	McKenzie	Steele, Pa.
Bruckner	Goodwin, Ark.	McLaughlin	Steenerson
Brumbaugh	Gordon	Madden	Stephens, Miss.
Burnett	Gray, Ala.	Magee	Stephens, Nebr.
Butler	Gray, Ind.	Mapes	Stephens, Tex.
Byrnes, S. C.	Green, Iowa	Matthews	Sterling
Byrns, Tenn.	Greene, Mass.	Mays	Stone
Callaway	Gregg	Miller, Del.	Stout
Campbell	Hadley	Montague	Summers
Candler, Miss.	Hamill	Morgan, La.	Sweet
Cannon	Hamilton, Mich.	Morgan, Okla.	Switzer
Carlin	Hamlin	Morrison	Talbott
Casey	Hardy	Moss	Tavener
Chapfield	Harrison, Miss.	Mudd	Taylor, Ark.
Coleman	Hawley	Murray	Taylor, Colo.
Collier	Heflin	Neely	Temple
Connelly	Helgesen	Nelson	Thomas
Conry	Helm	Nichols, Mich.	Thompson
Cooper, Ohio	Helvering	Nolan	Tillman
Cooper, W. Va.	Henry	North	Towner
Cooper, Wis.	Hilliard	Oliver	Treadway
Cox	Holland	O'Shaunessy	Vare
Cramton	Hollingsworth	Overmyer	Venable
Crisp	Hood	Padgett	Vinson
Crosser	Hopwood	Page, N. C.	Volstead
Danforth	Houston	Paige, Mass.	Walsh
Darrow	Howard	Park	Watkins
Davis, Tex.	Huddleston	Parker, N. J.	Watson, Pa.
Dent	Hughes	Porter	Watson, Va.
Dewalt	Hulbert	Pratt	Webb
Dickinson	Hull, Iowa	Price	Williams, T. S.
Dies	Hull, Tenn.	Quin	Williams, W. E.
Dill	Hutchinson	Rainey	Wilson, Ill.
Dillon	Igoe	Randall	Wilson, La.
Dixon	Jacoway	Rauch	Wingo
Dooling	James	Rayburn	Wise
Doolittle	Johnson, Ky.	Reavis	Wood, Ind.
Doughton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reilly	Woods, Iowa
Dowell	Johnson, Wash.	Ricketts	Young, N. Dak.
Drukker	Kahn	Riordan	Young, Tex.
Eagan	Keating	Roberts, Mass.	
Eagle	Keister	Rogers	
Edmonds	Kelley	Rubey	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Coady	Mann	Oldfield
Aiken	Capstick	Davis, Minn.
Anderson	Caraway	Decker
Beakes	Carew	Denison
Beales	Cary	Doremus
Britt	Cline	Driscoll
Britten	Copley	Dyer
Burgess	Cullop	Fess
Burke	Davenport	Finley

NOT VOTING—80.

Flood
Flynn
Gallivan
Gillett
Griest
Griffin
Guernsey
Harrison, Va.

Hart	Lafean	Moon	Sanford
Hayes	Lieb	Mooney	Saunders
Hayes	Liebel	Morin	Scott, Pa.
Hensley	Lindbergh	Norton	Scully
Hill	Lobeck	Oglesby	Shackelford
Hinds	Loft	Patten	Slemp
Howell	McCracken	Peters	Stiness
Jones	McCulloch	Pou	Tague
Kennedy, R. L.	McGillicuddy	Rowland	Tinkham
Kent	McLemore	Rucker	Van Dyke
Konop	Meeker	Russell, Ohio	Williams, Ohio
Kreider	Miller, Minn.	Sabath	Wilson, Fla.

So the amendment of Mr. CALDWELL was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania (in favor of all increases) with Mr. FESS (against).

Mr. TAGUE (in favor of increase) with Mr. HILL (against).

Mr. PATTEN (for) with Mr. OLDFIELD (against).

Mr. DYER (for) with Mr. DECKER (against).

Mr. COPLEY (for) with Mr. MOON (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. COADY with Mr. STINESS.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. SAUNDERS.

Mr. AIKEN with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio.

Mr. RUCKER with Mr. SANFORD.

Mr. OGLESBY with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. McLEMORE with Mr. TINKHAM.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY with Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio.

Mr. LOFT with Mr. ANDERSON.

Mr. LOBECK with Mr. BRITT.

Mr. LIEBEL with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. LIEB with Mr. CAPSTICK.

Mr. JONES with Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota.

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. DENISON.

Mr. HART with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. FLYNN with Mr. HOWELL.

Mr. FLOOD with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. BEAKES with Mr. BEALES.

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. LAFEAN.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. MCCracken.

Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. MCCULLOCH.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. MEEKER.

Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. MOONEY.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman from California in the Hall listening?

Mr. HAYES. No, sir; I was not.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WHEELER:

Page 19, line 20, strike out the figures "\$1,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,000."

Strike out the figures "\$660,000" in line 21, page 19, and insert in lieu thereof "\$880,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. WHEELER and Mr. ADAIR demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 185, nays 168, answered "present" 7, not voting 73, as follows:

YEAS—185.

Anthony	Cantrill	Darrow	Farley
Austin	Carter, Mass.	Davis, Minn.	Farr
Bacharach	Casey	Dempsey	Ferris
Barchfeld	Chandler, N. Y.	Denison	Focht
Benedict	Charles	Dillon	Fordney
Bennet	Church	Dooling	Freeman
Blackmon	Clark, Fla.	Doolittle	Gallagher
Bowers	Cooper, W. Va.	Dunn	Gandy
Browning	Costello	Dupré	Gardner
Bruckner	Crago	Ellsworth	Garland
Brumbaugh	Crisp	Elston	Glynn
Buchanan, Ill.	Curry	Gould	Graham
Buchanan, Tex.	Dale, N. Y.	Gray, Ala.	Gray, N. J.
Burnett	Dale, Vt.	Estopinal	
Caldwell	Dallinger	Evans	
Cannon	Danforth	Fairchild	

Greene, Vt.	Kless, Pa.	Mudd	Sloan
Hadley	King	Neely	Smith, Idaho
Hamilton, Mich.	Kinkaid	Nicholls, S. C.	Smith, Minn.
Hamilton, N. Y.	Langley	Nolan	Smith, N. Y.
Hamlin	Lazaro	North	Snell
Hardy	Lee	Onkey	Snyder
Haskell	Lehlbach	Olney	Steenerson
Hastings	Lenroot	O'Shaunessy	Stephens, Nebr.
Hawley	Leshner	Overymyer	Stone
Hayden	Lewis	Parker, N. Y.	Stout
Hayes	Linthicum	Phelan	Sulloway
Heaton	Littlepage	Platt	Sutherland
Helgesen	London	Porter	Swift
Henry	Loud	Powers	Talbott
Hernandez	McArthur	Pratt	Timberlake
Hicks	McDermott	Price	Van Dyke
Hopwood	McGillicuddy	Ragsdale	Volstead
Howard	McKellar	Raker	Walker
Hughes	McKinley	Randall	Walsh
Hull, Iowa	McLaughlin	Reavis	Ward
Humphrey, Wash.	Magee	Riordan	Wason
Husted	Maher	Roberts, Mass.	Watson, Pa.
Hutchinson	Martin	Roberts, Nev.	Whaley
Igoe	Matthews	Rodenberg	Wheeler
Johnson, S. Dak.	Meeker	Rogers	Williams, T. S.
Johnson, Wash.	Miller, Del.	Rowe	Winslow
Kahn	Miller, Pa.	Schall	Woods, Iowa
Kearns	Mondell	Sherwood	Young, N. Dak.
Keister	Moore, Pa.	Shouse	
Kent	Moore, Ind.	Siegel	
Key, Ohio	Mott	Sinnott	

NAYS—168.

Abercrombie	Dowell	Kincheloe	Sherley
Adair	Eagan	Kitchin	Sims
Adamson	Eagle	La Follette	Sisson
Alexander	Edmonds	Lever	Slayden
Allen	Emerson	Lloyd	Small
Almon	Esch	Longworth	Smith, Mich.
Ashbrook	Fields	McAndrews	Smith, Tex.
Aswell	Fitzgerald	McClintic	Stafford
Ayres	Flood	McFadden	Steagall
Bailey	Foss	McKenzie	Stedman
Barkley	Foster	McLemore	Steele, Iowa
Barnhart	Frear	Madden	Steele, Pa.
Bell	Fuller	Mapes	Stephens, Miss.
Black	Garner	Mays	Stephens, Tex.
Booher	Garrett	Montague	Sterling
Borland	Glass	Morgan, La.	Summers
Browne	Godwin, N. C.	Morgan, Okla.	Sweet
Butler	Good	Morrison	Switzer
Byrnes, S. C.	Goodwin, Ark.	Moss	Taylor, Ark.
Byrns, Tenn.	Goodwin	Murray	Taylor, Colo.
Callaway	Gray, Ind.	Nelson	Temple
Campbell	Green, Iowa	Nichols, Mich.	Thomas
Candler, Miss.	Greene, Mass.	Oliver	Thompson
Caraway	Gregg	Padgett	Tillman
Carlin	Hamill	Page, N. C.	Tilson
Chapfield	Haugen	Paige, Mass.	Towner
Coleman	Heflin	Park	Treadway
Collier	Helm	Parker, N. J.	Vare
Connelly	Helvering	Quin	Venable
Conry	Hilliard	Rainey	Vinson
Cooper, Ohio	Holland	Ramseyer	Watkins
Cooper, Wis.	Hollingsworth	Rauch	Watson, Va.
Cox	Hood	Rayburn	Webb
Cramton	Houston	Redly	Williams, W. E.
Crosser	Huddleston	Ricketts	Williams, Ohio
Davis, Tex.	Humphreys, Miss.	Rouse	Wilson, Ill.
Dent	Jacoway	Rubey	Wilson, La.
Dewalt	James	Russell, Mo.	Wingo
Dickinson	Johnson, Ky.	Scott, Mich.	Wise
Dies	Keating	Sears	Wood, Ind.
Dixon	Kelley	Sells	Woodyard
Doughton	Kennedy, Iowa	Shallenberger	Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Coady	Hulbert	Mann	Saunders
Harrison, Miss.	Hull, Tenn.	Oldfield	

NOT VOTING—73.

Aiken	Dyer	Konop	Rowland
Anderson	Edwards	Kreider	Rucker
Beakes	Fess	Lafcan	Russell, Ohio
Beales	Finley	Lieb	Sabath
Britt	Flynn	Liebel	Sanford
Britten	Gallivan	Lindbergh	Scott, Pa.
Burgess	Gillett	Lobeck	Scully
Burke	Griest	Loft	Shackleford
Capstick	Griffin	McCracken	Siemp
Carew	Guernsey	McCulloch	Sparkman
Carter, Okla.	Harrison, Va.	Miller, Minn.	Stiness
Cary	Hart	Moon	Taggart
Cline	Hensley	Mooney	Tague
Copley	Hill	Morin	Tavener
Cullop	Hinds	Norton	Tinkham
Davenport	Howell	Oglesby	Wilson, Fla.
Decker	Jones	Patten	
Doremus	Kennedy, R. I.	Peters	
Driscoll	Kettner	Pou	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. CAREW with Mr. ANDERSON.

Mr. COADY with Mr. STINESS.

Mr. HILL (for) with Mr. HULL of Tennessee (against).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (for) with Mr. SAUNDERS (against).

Mr. GALLIVAN (for) with Mr. HARRISON (against).

Mr. DYER (for) with Mr. DECKER (against).

Mr. TAGUE (for) with Mr. HULBERT (against).
 Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. GILLET (against).
 Mr. PATTEN (for) with Mr. OLDFIELD (against).
 Mr. CROLEY (for) with Mr. MOON (against).
 Mr. FESS (for) with Mr. HENSLEY (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. JONES with Mr. TINKHAM.

Mr. KETTNER with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. TAGGART with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. HINDS.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. CAPSTICK.

Mr. TAVENNER with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no." I am paired with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. TAGUE. I desire to withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. HULBERT, and he answered "Present."

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no." I find I am paired with the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. HILL. I desire to withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. HULL of Tennessee, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment striking out the Boston Subtreasury—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the first amendment to be considered of these Subtreasuries is that at Baltimore.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Baltimore amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 58, line 21, after the word "treasurer," insert the following:

"Strike out the balance of the paragraph after the word 'Treasurer,' and insert the following: 'Assistant treasurer, \$4,500; cashier, \$2,500; paying teller, \$2,000; receiving teller, \$1,900; exchange teller, \$1,800; vault clerk, \$1,800; clerks—two at \$1,600 each, three at \$1,400 each, three at \$1,200 each, three at \$1,000 each; messenger, \$840; three watchmen at \$720 each; in all, \$31,500.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. STAFFORD. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 232, noes 33.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one, the Boston amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 59, by striking out the paragraph beginning with line 1 and ending with line 9.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. We do not know what that means.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will listen to it when it is read. The Clerk will report it again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Boston, office of assistant treasurer: Assistant treasurer, \$5,000; cashier, \$2,500; paying teller, \$2,500; vault clerk, \$2,000; receiving teller, \$2,000; redemption teller, \$1,800; clerks—1, \$2,200; 5 at \$1,600 each; 1, \$1,500; 1, \$1,400; 2 at \$1,200 each; 3 at \$1,100 each; 4 at \$1,000 each; chief guard, \$1,100; 3 watchmen, at \$850 each; laborer and guard, \$720; 4 money counters and handlers for money laundry machines, at \$900 each; in all, \$46,570.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 59, by striking out the paragraph beginning with line 10 and ending with line 20, which reads as follows: "Chicago, office of assistant treasurer: Assistant treasurer, \$5,000; cashier, \$3,000; assistant cashier, \$2,000; vault clerk, \$2,250; paying teller, \$2,500; assisting teller, \$2,000; redemption teller, \$2,000; change teller, \$2,000; receiving teller, \$2,000; 2 bookkeepers, at \$1,500 each; clerks—1, \$1,750; 1, \$1,600; 3 at \$1,500 each; 13 at \$1,200 each; attendant for money laundry machines, \$1,200; hall man, \$1,100; messenger, \$840; 3 watchmen, at \$720 each; janitor, \$720; 8 money counters and handlers for money laundry machines, at \$900 each; in all, \$71,420."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Children's Bureau amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 22, page 134, insert a new paragraph, as follows: "To investigate and report upon matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and especially investigate the questions of infant mortality, \$72,120."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there are two amendments relating to the Children's Bureau. I ask unanimous consent that they may be voted upon together.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the vote may be taken upon the two amendments together as to the Children's Bureau. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the other amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Second amendment, line 16, page 135: Strike out the figures "\$58,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$95,000."

Mr. MANN. Upon the amendments I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks for the yeas and nays on these amendments. Those who favor taking the vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Evidently a sufficient number, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the amendments will answer "yea" when their names are called; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 316, nays 28, answered "present" 2, not voting 87, as follows:

YEAS—316.

Abercrombie	Drukker	Johnson, Wash.	Platt
Adair	Dunn	Kahn	Powers
Alexander	Dupré	Kearns	Pratt
Allen	Eagan	Keating	Quin
Anthony	Eagle	Kelster	Ragsdale
Ashbrook	Ellsworth	Kelley	Raker
Aswell	Elston	Kennedy, Iowa	Ramseyer
Austin	Emerson	Kent	Randall
Ayres	Esch	Kettner	Rauch
Bacharach	Estopinal	Key, Ohio.	Rayburn
Balley	Evans	Kless, Pa.	Reavis
Bachfield	Fairchild	Kincheloe	Reilly
Barkley	Farr	Kinkaid	Ricketts
Barnhart	Ferris	Kitchin	Riordan
Bell	Fields	Kitchin	Roberts, Mass.
Benedict	Focht	La Follette	Roberts, Nev.
Bennet	Foss	Langley	Rodenberg
Black	Foster	Lehlbach	Rogers
Bowers	Frear	Lenroot	Rouse
Browne	Freeman	Leshner	Rowe
Browning	Fuller	Lever	Rubey
Bruckner	Gallagher	Linthicum	Russell, Mo.
Brunbaugh	Gandy	Littlepage	Schall
Buchanan, Ill.	Gard	Lloyd	Scott, Mich.
Burnett	Gardner	London	Sears
Butler	Garland	Longworth	Sells
Byrnes, S. C.	Glass	Loud	Shallenberger
Caldwell	Good	McAndrews	Sherley
Campbell	Goodwin, Ark.	McArthur	Sherwood
Cannon	Gould	McClintic	Shouse
Cantrill	Gray, Ala.	McDermott	Siegel
Caraway	Gray, Ind.	McFadden	Sims
Carlin	Gray, N. J.	McGillcuddy	Sinnott
Carter, Mass.	Green, Iowa	McKellar	Sloan
Carter, Okla.	Greene, Mass.	McKenzie	Smith, Idaho
Casby	Greene, Vt.	McKinley	Smith, Mich.
Chandler, N. Y.	Gregg	McLaughlin	Smith, N. Y.
Charles	Hadley	McLemore	Smith, Tex.
Chipherfield	Hamill	Madden	Snell
Church	Hamilton, Mich.	Magee	Snyder
Clark, Fla.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Maher	Steagall
Coady	Hamm	Mann	Stedman
Coleman	Harrison, Miss.	Mapes	Steele, Pa.
Collier	Harrison, Va.	Martin	Steenerson
Connelly	Haskell	Matthews	Stephens, Miss.
Conry	Hastings	Mays	Stephens, Tex.
Cooper, Ohio	Hawley	Meeker	Sterling
Cooper, W. Va.	Hayden	Miller, Del.	Sterling
Cooper, Wis.	Hayes	Miller, Pa.	Stone
Costello	Heaton	Mondell	Stout
Cox	Hefflin	Moore, Pa.	Sulloway
Crago	Helgesen	Moore, Ind.	Summers
Cramton	Helvering	Morgan, La.	Sutherland
Crisp	Henry	Morgan, Okla.	Sweet
Crosser	Hernandez	Moss	Swift
Curry	Hicks	Mott	Switzer
Dale, N. Y.	Hilliard	Mudd	Talbott
Dale, Vt.	Holland	Murray	Tavener
Dallinger	Hollingsworth	Neely	Taylor, Ark.
Danforth	Hood	Nelson	Taylor, Colo.
Darrow	Hopwood	Nichols, Mich.	Temple
Davis, Minn.	Howard	Nolan	Thompson
Davis, Tex.	Huddleston	North	Tillman
Dempsey	Hughes	Oakey	Tilson
Denison	Hulbert	Oldfield	Timberlake
Dewalt	Hull, Iowa	Oliver	Towner
Dickinson	Humphrey, Wash.	Olney	Treadway
Dies	Humphreys, Miss.	O'Shaunessy	Van Dyke
Dill	Husted	Overmyer	Vare
Dillon	Hutchinson	Padgett	Venable
Dixon	Igoe	Paige, Mass.	Vinson
Dooling	Jacoway	Park	Volstead
Doolittle	James	Parker, N. J.	Walsh
Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Parker, N. Y.	Ward
Dowell	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Wason

Watson, Pa.
Whaley
Wheeler
Williams, T. S.

Williams, W. E.
Williams, Ohio
Wilson, Ill.
Wilson, La.

Wingo
Winslow
Wise
Wood, Ind.

Woods, Iowa
Woodyard
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Tex.

NAYS—28.

Almon
Booher
Borland
Buchanan, Tex.
Byrns, Tenn.
Callaway
Candler, Miss.

Dent
Fitzgerald
Garner
Garrett
Godwin, N. C.
Gordon
Hardy

Helm
Houston
Hull, Tenn.
Montague
Morrison
Nicholls, S. C.
Page, N. C.

Rainey
Slayden
Stafford
Steele, Iowa
Thomas
Watkins
Watson, Va.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Blackmon
Haugen

NOT VOTING—87.

Adamson
Aiken
Anderson
Beakes
Beales
Britt
Britten
Burgess
Burke
Capstick
Carew
Cary
Cline
Copley
Cullop
Davenport
Decker
Doremus
Driscoll
Dyer
Edmonds
Edwards

Farley
Fess
Finley
Flood
Flynn
Fordney
Gallivan
Gillett
Glynn
Graham
Griest
Griffin
Guernsey
Hart
Hensley
Hill
Hinds
Howell
Jones
Kennedy, R. I.
Konop
Kreider

Lafean
Lazaro
Lee
Lewis
Lieb
Liebel
Lindbergh
Lobeck
Loft
McCulloch
McCracken
McCulloch
Miller, Minn.
Moon
Mooney
Morin
Norton
Oglesby
Patten
Peters
Porter
Pou
Price

Rowland
Rucker
Russell, Ohio
Sabath
Sanford
Saunders
Scott, Pa.
Scully
Shackelford
Sisson
Slomp
Small
Smith, Minn.
Sparkman
Stiness
Taggart
Tague
Tinkham
Walker
Webb
Wilson, Fla.

So the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BLACKMON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my vote of yea and announce my pair with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote yea.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall and listening when his name was called?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I was in the doorway or very close to it. I was just between—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. DECKER with Mr. FESS.

Mr. ADAMSON with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. BLACKMON with Mr. DYER.

Mr. FLOOD with Mr. GLYNN.

Mr. FARLEY with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. LEE with Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. POE with Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. MOON with Mr. HILL.

Mr. SISSON with Mr. STINESS.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. WALKER with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.

Mr. TAGUE with Mr. GILLET.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how the Clerk has me recorded on roll call No. 7, on the Wheeler amendment?

The SPEAKER. As soon as this bill is disposed of the Chair will recognize the gentleman. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a motion to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GOOD. I am not.

The SPEAKER. Does any gentleman who is opposed to the bill want to make a motion to recommit?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a motion to recommit, but I am not opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. That puts the gentleman in the same class as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] who has the prior right to recognition. If no one opposed to the bill is going to make the motion, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], whose motion the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOOD moves to recommit H. R. 18542 to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to that committee to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out lines 14 to 22, inclusive, on page 51.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the matter proposed to be stricken out.

The Clerk read the matter proposed to be stricken out, as follows:

For investigation and experimentation and to secure better methods of administration, with a view to increased efficiency or to greater economy in the expenditure of public money, including necessary traveling expenses, in connection with special work, or obtaining of better administrative methods in any branch of the service within or under the Treasury Department, including the temporary employment of agents, stenographers, accountants, or other expert services either within or without the District of Columbia, \$15,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the motion to recommit was rejected.

The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ASPHALT LANDS OF THE CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW TRIBES IN OKLAHOMA.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider House joint resolution 306.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of House joint resolution 306, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 306.

Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time for payment of the deferred installments due on the purchase of tracts of the surface of the segregated coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes in Oklahoma.

Mr. MANN. I ask to have the resolution reported.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to extend the time for payment of the final installment due on the purchase of tracts of the surface of the segregated coal and asphalt land area belonging to the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes, sold under the act of Congress approved February 19, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 67), to four years after the sale was made instead of two years, as provided in section 5 of the said act: Provided, That the accrued interest on all installments to date when due and the principal of the second installment, if due, shall be paid before an extension as herein provided may be granted: And provided further, That in all other respects the provisions of existing law shall apply to these purchases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if this has the favorable indorsement of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. It has, and the bill was drawn by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

Hour of Meeting to-morrow.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give notice that the urgent deficiency bill will be called up the first thing to-morrow morning.

Adjournment for the holidays.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution No. 67.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, December 22, 1918, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Tuesday, January 2, 1919.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KITCHIN) there were—ayes 141, noes 44.

Mr. RAKER. I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. RUBEY. I call for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California makes the point of no quorum, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] demands the yeas and nays. The Chair will count.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. RUBEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Thirty-one gentlemen have risen, not a sufficient number.

Mr. COX. I ask for the other side.

The SPEAKER (after counting). One hundred and sixty gentlemen have arisen, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the resolution was agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record some data and facts which I have secured pertaining to the Agricultural Department and its service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Reserving the right to object, on what line?

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Relating to the employees and the service.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman criticize it?

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. No.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Boosts it? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Yes; I boost it a little.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 19119, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. GARRETT in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19119) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I will ask the gentleman how long he expects the House to remain in session to-night?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will say to the gentleman that I had no time set. I did not want to see several hours go to waste, however. I have had practically no applications for time in general debate, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Then I think perhaps we had better read the bill.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Oh, I trust the gentleman will not take up the time of the House in a first reading of the bill.

Mr. MANN. No one was anticipating that this bill would come up for consideration to-day. We met at 11 o'clock this morning with the avowed purpose of trying to get through the legislative bill and then quitting. I am not willing, if I can prevent it, to have the House taken unawares with the consideration of this bill, especially as we have already agreed to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow. I can see no difficulty, as far as we can look ahead, in finishing this bill by Friday.

Mr. MADDEN. I think we ought to have three or four hours of general debate on the bill.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. No one on this side wants any general debate on the bill, nor have any applications been made to the ranking Member on the Republican side, as I understand it.

Mr. MANN. I would suggest that we might dispense with the first reading of the bill and then rise. We have had a somewhat arduous day.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Let us read the first paragraph of the bill this afternoon.

Mr. MANN. As far as I am concerned, I have no objection to that.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I would be willing to do that, if the gentleman will permit me to make a statement of five minutes.

Mr. MANN. I do not care how long the statement is. I could listen to the gentleman for an hour.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Then I shall make the motion to rise, after reading the first paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration appropriates for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918. In making a brief statement as to the bill and the appropriations which it carries, I want to say to the committee that the legislative provision which, in one form or another, has been in this bill during the last three or four sessions of Congress, relative to the fiscal relations existing between the Government and the District of Columbia, is not contained in this bill. I desire to say, further, that this was left out, not because those who favor a different system than that now in force, having charge of the formulation of the appropriation bill, have in the slightest degree changed their minds as to what ought to be done in that particular; but it has been left out more for the reason that it seems futile to undertake to legislate this provision in an appropriation bill. Realizing that time is of some value at this particular session of Congress, we have omitted any legislation upon that subject.

The estimates submitted through the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for appropriations for the fiscal year for which the bill appropriates, exclusive of the water revenues, were \$16,278,092.66. The bill as reported to the House carries \$12,831,099.66, an amount \$255,222.56 in excess of the current law for the District. However, it is \$3,446,993 less than the estimates submitted by the commissioners.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. What were the improvements contemplated for which the commissioners asked for \$3,446,993 more than the committee recommended?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will say to the gentleman that there were a number of items that went to make up this sum. Some of the principal ones were estimates for the acquisition of a tract of land in the northwest for park purposes, carrying \$825,000; for the purchase of another tract of land for park purposes in the northeast, for which \$500,000 was asked. About the same amount was contained in the estimates for the construction of a municipal hospital. The other items were made up of smaller amounts, one of the others of those not mentioned being the purchase of land and the beginning of an appropriation for the beginning of a sewage-disposal plant, and the others were matters carrying not a large amount in themselves.

Mr. MADDEN. The committee concluded it was not wise to enter upon the construction, operation, and maintenance of a municipal hospital at this time?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The subcommittee formulating this bill decided that it was practically useless to bring a measure of that kind into the House of Representatives, having had some experience in dealing with that particular question. It was on all fours with the proposition I mentioned in the beginning of my remarks. It is one of those things which would merely consume time, amount to nothing, having been up on various occasions before, only to fail.

Mr. MADDEN. Did the committee conclude it was not time yet to consider the establishment of a sewage-disposal plant because there is no need for it in the District?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes, sir; partly that and partly from the fact that it would involve legislative provisions that would probably not be considered by the House, at least it would be subject to the point of order, and we knew of opposition to the matter that would keep us from considering it.

Mr. MADDEN. From the investigation the committee has made on the question of the necessity of a sewage-disposal plant has it reached the conclusion that there will be no such necessity in the immediate future?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Well, I can not say for the committee; but I can speak for myself that my own information is from an investigation and the evidence that has been taken before the committee that there will be no necessity in the immediate or near future.

Mr. MADDEN. Where does the sewage of the District go—out into the Potomac River?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. At the present time in the Potomac River.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman and his committee think the time is coming when there ought to be some other disposition made of the sewage in order to preserve the health

of the people who live below the city of Washington on the Potomac River?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Well, I will say to the gentleman in this connection that this bill does carry appropriation for the extension of certain sewer mains that will carry, when completed, that part of the sewage of the city that now enters into the Potomac near the city of Washington farther down the river.

Mr. MADDEN. Still the people living farther down are subject to contamination from the sewage that goes into the river from the city of Washington?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. That is true to the extent that there are people living farther down the river which, on personal investigation I think the gentleman from Illinois will find, are not very many. I do not think there is any immediate danger to the inhabitants living on the river from the disposal of the sewage. There is a necessity, unquestionably, for the getting of this sewage into the river at a point lower down the river.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman has made an investigation and knows the necessities of the case, and I merely asked this question to call the attention of the committee to the fact that there is no more important question than the disposition of the sewage in such a way that it will not contaminate the health of the people.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly, but I do not think the time has come when there is any amount of danger to the city of Washington or to the people on the river below.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the bill under consideration your committee has been in its own judgment, whatever may be the judgment of the House, rather liberal in the number of increases of employment in the service of the District of Columbia, as well as in certain increases of compensation to employees of the District, who would not come within the scope of the provision that was adopted to-day in connection with the Federal employees provided for in the legislative bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will yield, with pleasure.

Mr. MANN. The House this afternoon having voted to increase the compensation of certain Federal employees carried in the legislative bill, does the gentleman expect the House to make the same increase to employees of the District of Columbia employed here in the same place?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I think there is a necessity for it, and justice demands that the same provision should be placed in this bill before it is completed. And I will say to the gentleman that up to yesterday that had been the anticipation of the men having this bill in charge, to carry in the bill exactly the same provision that was in the legislative bill; but it is not in the bill at the present time for reasons I need not explain.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. If the gentleman from Illinois will pardon me, I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman plan to extend the horizontal per cent bonus to the employees carried in the District of Columbia appropriation bill?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The provision as drawn in the subcommittee, to be frank, and submitted to the full committee in connection with this bill, was to increase the pay of those employees in the District of Columbia receiving a salary of less than \$1,200 10 per cent, and of those receiving salaries of from \$1,200 to \$1,800 5 per cent.

Those excluded from this were the members of the Metropolitan police force, those who belonged to the fire organizations of the city, and those connected with the public schools. The provision as drawn by the subcommittee included also the same ratio of increase to the per diem employees of the District of Columbia. Those below the sum receiving an increase of 10 per cent, those above receiving an increase of 5 per cent. It also included a provision by which those employed by the District in institutions receiving their subsistence and now being paid less than \$1,000 a year should have an increase of 5 per cent in their salaries. That was the provision as drawn, and which I think measures out equity to the employees of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The House to-day having indicated by a substantial majority its desire to increase the pay of all the employees provided for in the legislative bill receiving a salary of \$1,800 or less, does the gentleman now think he ought to differentiate in the District between different classes of employment? I suppose they are just as hungry in one class as they are in another.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I will say to the gentleman that I think that in this particular case there is a reason for the exclusion of those classes I enumerated, and I think he will agree with me when I call his attention to it. In this bill last year, the current law, we increased the compensation of the police force. In the present bill we have undertaken to increase the compensation of the firemen of the District.

Mr. MANN. You have no right to do so. That will probably go out on a point of order.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Certainly it may, if we can not make our case. We have no right under the rule, the gentleman now suggests, but we did it because we thought there was sufficient equity in it, and so far as the police force is concerned that is past. Nobody can make a point of order, I think, against that.

Mr. MANN. But that occurred before the present emergency arose. To be perfectly frank with the gentleman, it was the agreement with other Members of the House to defeat any increase reported in the legislative bill, with the understanding on my part—possibly I was foolish not to secure sufficient knowledge concerning it—that if that prevailed and the House would not increase the amount, the increase would be carried to all the employees of the Government receiving those salaries.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I can say to the gentleman that to the Metropolitan police I am entirely friendly, and I will be glad to include them in any just scheme. But I imagine that the pinch of the high cost of living is no worse in Washington than in the gentleman's city, and we increase their salaries to a plane that will compare with even those of the size of the city from which the gentleman comes.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; not at all. But that is neither here nor there. However, it is nothing like it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I think the grades are not organized on the same basis, but still they compare most favorably with salaries paid the police forces of cities corresponding in size with the city of Washington. The same is true of the fire department, and so far as the school organization is concerned—and the gentleman knows and every other gentleman knows that under the plan of organization and under the law that controls the automatic promotion of the teachers of the school system of the city of Washington that they are more highly paid on the average than they are in any other city, not only of the size, but of any other size, in this country. And we thought there ought to be some equity in this matter, and, therefore, it was in the mind of the committee to exclude those. But, I remind the gentleman, this has passed entirely out of the hands of the Appropriations Committee. It is in the hands of the House. There is no provision now in this bill. It can not get into this bill if there is anybody in the House who wants to make a point of order against it, unless there is a rule provided. It is up to the Committee on Rules, it seems to me, as to the automatic increase of the salaries in this bill.

Mr. BENNET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BENNET. As a member of the Committee on Rules, are we to construe that as a request for a rule?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I have not requested it. I can not answer the gentleman whether any other gentleman has requested it or not.

Mr. MANN. The experience of the Committee on Appropriations is not such that they are running to the Committee on Rules on every question?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Not every morning; no, sir.

Mr. BENNET. You are always very willing for the Committee on Rules to give rules to the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Well, the House seems to be, whatever may be the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations.

I was going to say when I was interrupted that there are about 100 new employments provided for in this bill. However, there are 110 less than were asked for in the estimates submitted to us. We have here and there increased the compensation of certain employees of the District of Columbia for reasons that seemed to the committee to be good and sufficient. Of course, in many instances, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] suggested awhile ago, we recognize the fact that they were subject to a point of order, and any gentleman, if alert enough, can forbid us carrying into effect the purpose we had in raising this compensation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with that statement I have concluded. Under the five-minute rule there will be much discussion of various items. I ask that the Clerk may read the first paragraph of the bill.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield me three or four minutes?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Yes; but I want to keep faith. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who believe that the organic act of the District of Columbia, known as the "half-and-half act," has outlived its usefulness and that it can be repealed without doing any injustice to the people of the District of Columbia, but that equity and justice to the people of the United States demands that it be repealed.

I know this is the short session of Congress, and I have conferred with some friends who believe as I do, and they think that it is inexpedient to attempt a fight again at this short session to repeal the half-and-half act on this appropriation bill. It is the practice that when legislation is placed upon an appropriation bill, if the other House refuses to agree to it, the House proposing the legislation recedes. This House last session passed on the District appropriation bill a provision repealing the half-and-half act, but the Senate refused to concur; and I apprehend if we should get the repeal again incorporated in this bill the other branch, constituted now just as it was during the last session of this Congress, would again refuse to concur, and the House would have to recede.

That being true, I do not intend to call the matter up at this session, but I have in nowise changed my opinion about the merits of the proposition, and I am confident that when the people of the United States understand the proposition the law will be repealed. And if I am living when the next Congress convenes, composed of a number of new Representatives from the people, a number of new Members in both branches, I will again call the attention of Congress to it and try to have the law repealed.

I simply make this statement for the reason that I do not care for the press of this city and others to assume that I have abandoned the fight, for I will not abandon it until in my judgment equity is done the people of the United States. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That one half of the following sums, respectively, is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, in full for the following expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, namely:

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. GARRETT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 19119) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing an article appearing in the Chicago Herald, of Sunday, December 8, and written by Mr. James Keeley, the editor, on the United States business after the war.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing the article indicated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 324. Joint resolution authorizing payment of the salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1918.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 7095. An act extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River, authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved the 24th day of August, 1912.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously made, until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 20, 1916, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on reexamination of New River, N. C., and inland waterways between Beaufort Harbor and New River, and New River and Swansboro (H. Doc. No. 1775); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a tentative draft of a bill to authorize the acquirement of a site and the erection and equipment of a building for use of the post office and other governmental offices at Oakland, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 1776); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report of the Secretary of the Treasury relative to the United States Subtreasuries and their relation to the Federal reserve bank (H. Doc. No. 1777); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Lewis H. Gest v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1778); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting an urgent estimate of appropriation for rent of temporary quarters for the office of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia, pending the reconstruction of the courthouse (H. Doc. No. 1779); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13799) granting an increase of pension to D. O. Root; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8268) granting a pension to Josephine W. James; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 19178) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 19179) to exclude from the United States mails all printed matter advertising for sale or soliciting the sale of intoxicating liquors addressed to points within certain States and Territories, and providing penalties for violations; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 19180) to provide for a survey and estimate of cost of removing bends in Black River at Lorain, Ohio; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STAFFORD: A bill (H. R. 19181) to authorize the coinage of one-half-cent pieces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 19182) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Board of Trade of Crafton Heights, Crafton, Allegheny County, Pa., two bronze cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 19183) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the city of Fond du Lac, county of Fond du Lac, State of Wisconsin, four condemned bronze or brass cannon with carriage and suitable outfit of cannon balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET: A bill (H. R. 19184) granting two weeks' sick leave to letter carriers in the City Free Delivery Service and to post-office clerks in first and second class post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 19185) to establish in the Treasury Department a roll designated as "the special

life-saving medal-of-honor roll," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 19186) to regulate and control the use of submersible craft in the streams, lakes, channels, harbors, and territorial waters of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HULBERT: A bill (H. R. 19187) to reduce the unnecessary amount of overtime required of letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and post-office clerks in first and second class post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 19188) to prohibit the manufacture or sale of alcoholic liquors in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A resolution (H. Res. 414) for the consideration of House joint resolution 323; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FLOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue temporary permits for additional diversions of water from the Niagara River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 19189) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 19190) granting an increase of pension to Arthur C. Gregg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 19191) granting an increase of pension to Ida Noblitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19192) granting an increase of pension to David H. Hatfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 19193) for the relief of Zachary T. Heal; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 19194) granting an increase of pension to Augustus B. Dotson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 19195) granting an increase of pension to Ross Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19196) granting an increase of pension to Henry Keech; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COSTELLO: A bill (H. R. 19197) granting a pension to Gottfried J. Maier; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 19198) for the relief of David L. Barry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 19199) granting a pension to Charles McHugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 19200) granting a pension to Ellen Sicker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 19201) to muster in and muster out R. M. C. Gavin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19202) for the relief of William Grimsley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 19203) granting a pension to Martin Heinrich Jensen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 19204) granting an increase of pension to John Spelman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 19205) for the relief of S. S. Markley; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 19206) granting a pension to Charles Haiste; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 19207) granting an increase of pension to John J. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19208) granting an increase of pension to Lewis B. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19209) granting an increase of pension to Roy Jackman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 19210) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 19211) granting an increase of pension to Ananias B. Reeser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 19212) granting a pension to Josephine G. Linn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 19213) granting a pension to Francis M. Perfect; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 19214) for the relief of Mary C. Mayers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 19215) granting a pension to Jack D. Bement; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19216) granting a pension to George D. Bement; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 19217) granting an increase of pension to Adam B. Shepherd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 19218) granting an increase of pension to Marian A. Jaques; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 19219) granting an increase of pension to Orrin J. Belden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 19220) granting an increase of pension to Bertha Fenz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 19221) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Hodges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19222) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Regan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 19223) granting an honorable discharge to Edward S. Conkling; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 19224) granting a pension to Charles H. Ricker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 19225) for the relief of Alfred C. Scheu, as attorney for the Jacob Scheu estate; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 19226) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Bacon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 19227) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Pelkey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 19228) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Blanch C. Loveland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 19229) for the relief of the heirs of Ko-mo-dal-kiah, a Moses agreement allottee No. 33; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19230) to cancel the allotment of Ollie House, Shoshone Indian Reservation, Wyo.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 19231) granting a pension to Sarah A. Moulton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 19232) granting an increase of pension to John Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition from the employees of the sixteenth lighthouse district, Ketchikan, Alaska, asking for increase of salaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of F. C. Stanley and other employees in the Postal Service at Holton, Kans., asking for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 18892, for the relief of Peter Heis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHARACH: Memorial of Rotary Club, Camden, N. J., in re 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of National Association, Bureau of Animal Industry Employees, favoring passage of House bill 16060, the Lobeck bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Dahlstrom Metallic Door Co., Jamestown, N. Y., for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Troy (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to widening of Narrows of Lake Champlain; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Omar Baumes, of New York City, relative to pay of inspectors of customs at port of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of William K. Field, of The Bronx, N. Y., favoring the Nolan bill, House bill 11876; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of William E. Fitch, M. D., of New York, in re Gandy bill, House bill 17125; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: Memorial of sundry citizens and organizations of the seventh Pennsylvania district favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry post-office employees of the seventh Pennsylvania district for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the seventh Pennsylvania district relative to high cost of living; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Petition of Woman's Club, of Hastings, Minn., indorsing woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of J. G. Kapper and other employees of post office of Red Wing, Minn., for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DILLON: Two petitions of sundry postal employees asking for increased compensation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Aurora County (S. Dak.) branch, opposing embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: Petition of civil-service employees of the port of New Orleans, La., favoring civil-service retirement law; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. EAGAN: Memorial of Board of Education of Lincoln, Nebr., in re work of Naturalization Bureau; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of employees of the Alameda (Cal.) post office, for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of post-office employees of Wisconsin, for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, papers in support of House bill 19081, granting an increase of pension to George K. Redmond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of I. A. Bennett Co., of Chicago, Ill., for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of employees of terminal railway post offices, for readjustment of salaries, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Winwal Co., of Rockford, Ill., opposing an embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GLYNN: Petitions of post-office employees of Winsted, Ansonia, and Naugatuck, Conn., for increased pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Petitions of employees of post offices of Wagoner and Okmulgee, Okla., favoring increase in salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Petition of sundry post-office employees of New Mexico, for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petitions of Candy Bros. Manufacturing Co., St. Louis Screw Co., St. Louis Lightning Rod Co., Mexican-American Hat Co., St. Louis Retail Grocers' Association, St. Louis Surfacers & Paint Co., all of St. Louis; Wyeth Hardware & Manufacturing Co., of St. Joseph; and Rothenberg & Schloss Cigar Co. and National Aniline & Chemical Co., of Kansas City, all in the State of Missouri, in favor of 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PAGE of North Carolina: Papers to accompany House bill 19101, for pension to Mrs. Wirt Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Evidence in support of House bill 19160, for relief of Nora D. Groves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 19161, for pension for Albert J. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROWE: Petition of Combustion Engineering Corporation, of New York, in re tube service in Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Roessler & Hasslacher Chemical Co., of New York, favoring 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEAGALL: Memorial of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Clayton, Ala., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWEET: Petition of employees of post offices of Cedar Falls and Eagle Grove, Iowa, for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas (by request): Two petitions of sundry railway mail clerks, post-office clerks, and rural carriers, of Hot Springs, Ark., for higher wages; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of Van D. Fowler and others, of Hot Springs, Ark., for an embargo on food and munitions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petitions of employees of the post offices at Littleton, Longmont, and Sterling, Colo., for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, December 20, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for the revelation of Thyself, so clear, so glorious as that all of us can come to Thee in prayer. We seek to justify our ways to men, but we care more that Thou shalt look with favor upon our acts. We fear not them that may kill the body but we fear Him who has power to destroy both body and soul in hell. We come at last with our stewardship before Thee and Thou must pass upon our acts. Give us Thy grace and Thy wisdom. Surround us with Thy providence. Give us the spirit that we may be led in all things to conform our lives to Thy will and glorify Thy name, and through Thy glory bring larger blessings to the people whom we serve. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PURCHASE OF FOOD SUPPLIES (S. DOC. NO. 645).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the Senate of the 15th instant, certain information relative to the purchasing of food supplies by Army officers and employees through Government agencies, which, on motion of Mr. GALLINGER, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE (S. DOC. NO. 644).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a circular issued by the Nobel committee furnishing information as to the distribution of the Nobel peace prize for the year 1917, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution providing that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, December 22, 1916, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Tuesday, January 2, 1917, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 18542. An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes;

H. R. 19178. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time for payment of the deferred installments due on the purchase of tracts of the surface of the segregated coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes in Oklahoma.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) authorizing payment of the salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1916, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WORKS. I have telegrams relating to the curtailment of the electric energy at Niagara Falls which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The telegrams were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CAL., December 20, 1916.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
Washington, D. C.:

Curtailment of electric energy by the Canadian Government at Niagara Falls affects deliveries of grinding products used in our shops. This curtailment means to us a big loss of time and labor. We would appreciate your efforts to relieve the situation.

KILLIFER MANUFACTURING CO. (INC.).

LOS ANGELES, CAL., December 19, 1916.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
Washington, D. C.:

Curtailment of electric energy by the Canadian Government at Niagara Falls affects deliveries of grinding products used in our shops. This curtailment means to us a big loss of time and labor. We would appreciate your efforts to relieve the situation.

UNION TOOL CO.

LOS ANGELES, CAL., December 19, 1916.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
Washington, D. C.:

Curtailment of electric energy by the Canadian Government at Niagara Falls affects deliveries of grinding products used in our shops. This curtailment means to us a big loss of time and labor. We would appreciate your efforts to relieve the situation.

JOSEPH MUSTO KEEHAN CO.

LOS ANGELES, CAL., December 20, 1916.

Hon. JOHN D. WORKS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Mining interests of West seriously affected by cyanide shortage. Immediate cause of present shortage due to Canadian Government's embargo on power expectation from Canadian plans to United States industries, we request that you use your best endeavors to have our Government protest against arbitrary withdrawal of power by Canadian Government, power developed with United States capital on Canadian side of Falls. We also urge that our Government permit the immediate temporary diversion of water to full capacity. Existing United States power installations suggest to secure cooperation of Senators and Congressmen of other Western States. Delegations from eastern industries are in Washington to-day and to-morrow conferring with the proper Government officials.

CHAMBER OF MINES AND OIL,
By THEODORE MARTIN, President.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a petition of the members of the Bible School of the First Church of Christ of Kingman, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of intoxicating liquor into prohibition States, and also for prohibition in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HITCHCOCK presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Omaha, Nebr., praying for the installation of a pneumatic-tube mail service in that city, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. KENYON presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Avoca, Iowa, praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the Chamber of Commerce of Council Bluffs, and of members of the Osceola County bar and the Lyon County bar, of Iowa, praying for the use of all surplus fees received by the Federal Government from applicants for citizenship for education of the aliens in his civic privileges, duties, and responsibilities, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee presented petitions of sundry citizens of Tennessee, praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented a petition of the port commission of Seattle, Wash., praying for an investigation of commercial trade opportunities in China and the establishment of direct trade relations between China and the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Whiteson, Oreg., praying for the placing of an embargo on food products and for the enactment of legislation to prevent the storage of food products by speculators, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Sheridan, Wyo., praying for an increase in salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Shoshone Water Users' Association, of Powell, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the provisions of the Federal farm-loan act to reclamation projects, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have a telegram from my home town, signed by the Hall Printing Press Co., referring to